

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

No. 4.—OCTOBER—1908.

---

I.

EDUCATION AND PESSIMISM.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. J. SPANGLER KIEFFER, D.D.

The recent establishment, at Franklin and Marshall College, of a chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, may well be regarded as an event of special significance and importance, and one worthy of the recognition and commemoration which it is the purpose of our present assembly to accord it. The significance and importance of the event are derived from the origin and character of the Society itself. Among the many organizations, connected with universities and colleges, to which it may seem to bear an outward resemblance, it is the peculiarity of this association that it owes its origin to respect for scholarship, to love of literature, to interest in the cause of liberal culture. Among these various associations for various objects, it seems very appropriate that there should be one which stands simply for the intellect and the beautiful things pertaining to the intellectual life. The founding, at this time, of a chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa, in connection with this institution, may be considered opportune. It would seem to be axiomatic, indeed, that in literary institutions there

<sup>1</sup> The address delivered at the inauguration of the Theta chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Franklin and Marshall College, May, 1908.

should be a predominant regard for things literary, that educational establishments should be characterized by a predominant interest in matters educational. Yet there are times when, and circumstances in which, it may be neither unnecessary nor inopportune to recall attention to these primary and axiomatic truths.

It has been pointed out as a curious circumstance that, after so many centuries of discussion, there should be as yet no unanimity of opinion as to the principle on which, or the means by which, the educational process ought to be conducted, nay, that the very object of the process should itself be still a matter of dispute. Still, as of old, there are those who, as regards the object of education, lay the emphasis on *knowing*, and, as regards the means by which it may best be accomplished, upon the impartation of knowledge, especially of such knowledge as is supposed to be of a practical and useful character. They say, Let a system of education have some practical purpose; let the boy at school or the young man at college be taught what is worth knowing, that is, what can be turned to practical account, and nothing else. Still, as of old, there are those who, as regards the object of education, lay the stress on *being*, and, as regards the means by which it is to be accomplished, upon such disciplining and training as may result in the development of faculty, the formation of character, the breeding of power. They say, Let the capabilities and powers be so disciplined as to come finally to their highest and best estate, to their most perfect and harmonious development; let the youth at school or college be so trained, in respect of his intellectual and moral faculties and powers, as to become eventually what he was intended to be. We do not say, either, on the one hand, that the utilitarians entirely disregard the necessity of disciplining the faculties, nor, on the other, that those who are opposed to them wholly overlook the necessity of communicating knowledge; but that these are their predominant characteristics, respectively, as distinguished from each other.

Between these two educational theories the conflict has been, and is still being, waged. Now one, now the other, seems to prevail. There are times of uncertainty, vacillation, experimentation, not without embarrassment and confusion on the one hand, not without significance and value on the other. There are periods when educational theories seem to be wandering in the wilderness; when the whole cause of education seems to be, for the time being, at sea. Through such a period of uncertainty and experimentation we seem recently to have been passing. At the last annual meeting of one of the leading educational associations of the country, composed of a large number of university and college presidents and professors, the president of the association, who is at the same time the president of one of our leading universities, speaking of recent experimentation on the basis of pedagogical theories, is reported to have said: "You know perfectly well what the result has been; you know that the children of the past two or three decades have not been educated; you know that with all our training we train nobody; you know that with all our educating we educate nobody. I have had the experience (which I am sure is common to modern teachers) of feeling that I was spending all my efforts to do a thing which was not susceptible of being done, and that the teaching which I professed to do was as if done in a vacuum, as if done without an atmosphere in which the forces could be transmitted. I am not indicting other persons any more than I am indicting myself. I have been teaching now for nearly twenty years; I have been conducting class-room exercises for nearly twenty years; and I don't think I have been teaching any appreciable portion of that time." It is somewhat startling, and also somewhat discouraging, to hear one of the chief representatives of the cause of education speak in this manner. His words, it is true, are to be understood according to the spirit, and not according to the letter; nevertheless they illustrate well what we have said of the still existing uncertainty and indecision

as to the object of education and the means by which it may best be effected.

That there should be so much obscurity, fluctuation, and lack of finality in regard to educational matters, will appear less surprising when we consider the vastness, complexity and mysteriousness of that intellectual and moral being of man with which the educational process has to do. Meanwhile, there is one point on which there would probably be perfect unanimity of opinion and belief: Education, whatever the principle of it may be, and whatever the methods by which it seeks to accomplish its object, ought to be an emancipating and enfranchising, an expanding and enlarging, a strengthening and enabling, an uplifting and ennobling force. It ought to make men large and strong, and free, and noble. The educated man ought to be, in the most comprehensive sense of the word, the able man. It belongs to the idea of education to make intellectual and moral cosmos out of intellectual and moral chaos. It is a thing, in the words of Carlyle, "of capabilities developed, of habits established, of dispositions well dealt with; of tendencies confirmed and tendencies repressed; a laborious separating of the character into two *firmaments*; shutting down the subterranean, well down and deep; an earth and waters, and what lies under them; then your everlasting azure sky, and immeasurable depths of ether hanging over them." Development, and, in order to development, organization and order, would seem to be the chief things to be aimed at by the educational process. "The greatest discovery ever made in the art of war," says Mr. Bryce, in his "*American Commonwealth*," "was when men began to perceive that organization and discipline count for more than numbers. This discovery gave the Spartan infantry a long career of victory in Greece, and the Swiss infantry a not less brilliant renown in the later Middle Ages. The Americans made a similar discovery in politics some forty or fifty years ago." This truth, well recognized as regards matters military and matters political, would not seem to be as yet sufficiently

recognized in regard to matters educational. This much, however, the need of intellectual discipline, the necessity of "the establishment of a strong central authority in the mind, by which all its powers are regulated and directed," those of the utilitarian school can hardly fail to concede to their opponents. On the other hand, to the utilitarians this may well be conceded, that education ought to have a practical object and serve a useful purpose. This concession may well be made, provided there is a clear and correct understanding of what is practical and useful. The educated man ought certainly to be able, in consequence of his education, to do, to be of account practically, to render service. But service to whom? Certainly not merely to himself; certainly, let it be said boldly, to none other than God and his fellow men. When Walter de Merton, in 1264, established at Oxford University, which had long previously existed, the college which still bears his name, becoming thereby the founder of what is known as the "college system" characteristic of that ancient center of learning, and giving to his college afterwards, in 1274, a body of statutes drawn up with such remarkable sagacity and foresight that they continued in force until the year 1856, he did so, as he expressed it, to provide for the education of "a succession of men capable of doing good service in Church and State." That is what institutions of learning are for; they are for the service of men, in regard both to things civil and religious, in regard to all that pertains to the best interests of the race, temporally and spiritually. When, in 1532, three years after Cardinal Wolsey's fall, Henry VIII. took up his great minister's design and re-founded Cardinal College, first giving it his own name, then, in 1545, dissolving it, and finally reconstituting it under its present name of Christ Church, though the endowment of this institution was derived largely from the spoils of the Church, through the suppression of the monasteries, yet the king deserves credit for a sincere desire to promote learning, and for an intelligent comprehension of its importance to the

welfare of his kingdom. This is evident from his memorable reply to some of his courtiers, who, in their selfishness and greed, had fondly hoped that he would have dealt with university endowments, and especially with those of his Cardinal's College, as he had dealt with the monasteries. "Whereas," said the king, as reported by Holinshed, "we had a regard onlie to pull down sin by defacing the monastries, you have a desire also to overthrow all goodness by subversion of colleges. I tell you, sirs, that I judge no land in England better bestowed than that which is given to our universities. For by their maintenance our realme shall be well governed when we be dead and rotten." These wise words should be remembered to the credit of Henry VIII., as a partial offset to much that is to his discredit. He had the insight to perceive the vital relation of education to the public weal, to the cause of good government, to "all goodness." Education ought, in the most practical manner, to subserve the welfare of mankind. The educated man ought, by virtue of his education, to belong to "the salt of the earth"; to be a servant and a helper to his fellow-men; a leader and a guide in all things relating to human progress, an awakener and inspirer of souls; a force for the preservation of the age in which he lives from becoming a decadent and despairing age.

Whether education has always accomplished, whether it is at present, in any sufficient measure, accomplishing this object; whether it is capable of becoming, instead of an enriching and enabling, an impoverishing and disabling force, or, while enriching and enabling in one direction, of impoverishing and disabling in another; whether there is a type of education of which it is characteristic to breed the spirit of cynicism and pessimism; and whether, if these things are so, what is the reason of them,—these are questions worthy of consideration.

There are not wanting those who, speaking with authority, bring against the universities of to-day grave charges of fail-

ure in respect of moral leadership. It was not a stranger, it was a distinguished professor in one of the foremost of these universities themselves, who, in a recent address, deplored the possibility of the future historian's being obliged to record that "by the middle of the twentieth century the higher institutions of learning had lost all influence over public opinion in the United States," and that the people at large had resorted to "the guidance of certain private literary adventures, commonly designated in the market by the affectionate name of ten-cent magazines." Referring to this address, a recent writer, in a quarterly review of high standing, says that the historian of to-day "is able to affirm that the premier influence in the American mind is no longer that which springs from the universities and colleges, in spite of the enormous increase of their endowments and students. He is able to say that in the last fifteen years no single cherished American institution has lost much more in the public esteem than the university." It is charged against the universities by this same writer that "they have furnished the leaders of the great predatory enterprises, they have furnished the stock-gamblers and market-manipulators, and they have not denied to these social pests academic recognition and fellowship." When it is suggested that it is the office of the universities to "raise the tone of democracy," the suggestion, it is said, "simply fills the air with laughter." We are not saying that these accusations are true; the significant thing is that they should be capable of being made.

Again, it was not an outsider, it was a professor in Yale University, who, a few years since, in an article in *The Arena*, discussed the question whether education tends to produce pessimists. This writer notes "the tendency among college-bred men to stand coldly and critically aloof from all movements towards social betterment, and to consider themselves as mere onlookers in the drama of human suffering." The spirit bred in them by the system of teaching under which they have been educated in universities and colleges, often

results, it is claimed, in the practical withdrawal of educated men from participation in moral and political reforms. They regard politics as "a hopeless mass of corruption," and moral reform as "a mixture of sentiment and simplicity in equal proportions." And so it comes to pass that the work of reform is often led by narrow, ignorant, incompetent men, "while the man who is able to see all sides of the question, and to penetrate to the root of the evil, sits aloof among his books." It is not a new complaint. Long ago Professor Blackie said, "You philosophers and professors sit in the seat of Aristotle and measure out truth by the yard; but in the world of action it is the bores and the bigots who do all the good."

What has been said is sufficient to show that the charge that education is capable of producing pessimism, of being an impoverishing, instead of an enriching, a disqualifying, instead of an enabling, force, is not an altogether groundless one. It is evident, however, upon a moment's reflection, that the charge properly lies, not against education itself, but against a certain type or system of education. Education is unquestionably an inestimable blessing. It has always been sought, and always will be sought; we should be in a state of barbarism without it; nor can anything that may be said of the evils attending or resulting from the process of acquiring it detract ought from the value of the thing itself in its own proper character. But it is to be remembered that things precious are perilous in proportion to their preciousness. There is no great blessing but carries wrapped up in itself the possibility of a great curse. Even the Gospel of Jesus Christ may be "a savor of death unto death," as well as "a savor of life unto life." Things good in themselves are good or bad according to the manner in which they are given, received and used. Still further, they are good, or bad, or less good, according as they correspond, or fail to correspond, or correspond only partially, with the true idea of their own being. It is not strange that a particular kind

of education, it may be the kind of education given at any particular time in universities and colleges, should prove to be in some respects a disabling, rather than an enabling force; should be found capable of producing pessimism and futility, instead of hope, courage and accomplishing power.

This result is not unlikely to follow from any system of education which is based on the assumption that it is the end and aim of the educational process to communicate knowledge. Now, it is true, this process has much to do with the communication of knowledge, not being capable of existing without it. But it is equally true that such communication is not the chief object of it. Great, and greatly to be valued, is knowledge. The acquisition, the accumulation, the transmission of it, are of great importance to the welfare of the human race. Nevertheless, while, under one aspect, it needs to be magnified, it certainly needs, under another, to be disparaged. Rather, it is no disparagement of it to assign to it its own proper position and relation of subordination. "Knowledge," as the proverb tells us, "is power." But the ability to use knowledge wisely is a greater thing than the knowledge itself. Knowledge is a thing to be desired and valued for the sake of the beneficent purposes it may be made to subserve. The mere acquisition and possession of knowledge, for its own sake, can hardly be said to be a desirable thing. Some one has remarked that the ambition to be a learned man, apart from all practice and all service, is no better than the ambition to be a fat man. We do not find that many persons are consumed by the ambition of being physically fat; rather the reverse; that is a danger against which no warning is needed. The same cannot be said as regards the danger of becoming intellectually fat. There are those whose ambition would seem to be the mere accumulation and possession of knowledge; going from school to college, from college to university, from post-graduate course to post-graduate course; laying up constantly increasing stores of information; becoming more and more learned, and, sometimes, less and less capable of using

their learning. Such need to be reminded that a man of extensive information is a very poor imitation of a scholar; that a well-filled mind is not necessarily a well-trained mind; that a corpulent intellect is one thing, and a sinewy and athletic intellect is another.

No; it is not the object of education merely to communicate knowledge, however much it may necessarily have to do with such communication. And a system of education based on this assumption is likely to be attended by certain undesirable results. In particular it is likely to breed the pessimistic attitude and spirit, and so to be actually an impoverishing, even while it seems to be an enriching, process. Not that there is anything necessarily tending to produce pessimism in knowledge itself; provided it be full and justly proportioned. This tendency towards pessimism reveals itself especially when the knowledge sought and obtained is merely knowledge of things external, superficial, circumstantial, and yet claims to be a knowledge of things fundamental, essential and general. Let a man concentrate his regard upon the lower order of facts, let him devote his energies to the acquisition of knowledge pertaining to the physical and natural world, to the deliberate exclusion of the whole realm of moral and spiritual truth; let him become, so to speak, a mere naturalist, disregarding and disowning all that does not belong to the naturalist's world; and there will presently be perceptible in him a tendency towards pessimism. Naturalism and realism would seem to go hand in hand with pessimism.

But, above all, may knowledge be not only consistent with, but productive of pessimism, when, whatever the quantity or the quality of it, it is simply knowledge and nothing more, when it is a thing of what Bacon calls "*intellectus sibi permisus*," when the power to know is unaccompanied by the power to do. Information without ability, a well-filled mind associated with an untrained or ill-trained will, the recognition of what is right without the capability of following it, the perception of what is good without the power of doing it,

—this is destructive of all hope and joy and peace, this is of the very essence of forlornness, futility, despair. Abundance of knowledge may go hand in hand with sterility and incompetence; and the combination is one of the most fruitful causes of pessimism. More than two thousand years ago, there was uttered by a Persian soldier a certain sentence which gives vivid expression to the truth we are affirming. It was just before the battle of Plataea, and the Persians were full of melancholy forebodings as to the result. At a banquet given by the Theban leader, Attaginus, to which he had invited Mardonius, along with fifty Persian and fifty Boeotian or Theban guests, there was present an Orchomenian, Thersander by name, to whom his Persian neighbor communicated his feelings. “Seest thou these Persians here feasting,” said he, “and the army which we left yonder encamped near the river? Yet a little while, and out of all these thou shalt behold but few surviving.” The words (it is said by Grote, from whose history we are taking the incident) were spoken with strange emotion, and when Thersander expressed his astonishment and said, “Surely thou art bound to reveal this to Mardonius,” the Persian rejoined; “My friend, man cannot avert that which God hath decreed to come; no one will believe the revelation, sure though it be. Many of us Persians know this well, and are here serving only under the bond of necessity. *And surely this is the most hateful of all human sufferings—to be full of knowledge and at the same time to have no power over any result* (*έχθίστη δὲ ὁδύνη ἔστι τῶν ἐν αὐθράποισι ἀντη, πολλὰ φρονέοντα μηδενὸς κρατέειν*).” Herodotus, who relates the incident, had it from Thersander himself. “To be full of knowledge, and to have no power over any result”—this is a Persian soldier’s way of describing that wretched condition of knowledge combined with helplessness and powerlessness, which St. Paul afterwards described in the seventh chapter of Romans; saying, on the one hand, “We know that the law is spiritual,” but bewailing, on the other, the inability to conform to it. “For to will is present with me; but how to per-

form that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do."

An education which consists in the communication of knowledge alone, is no sufficient preservative against, nay, may under certain conditions, actually tend to produce, the pessimistic spirit. Nor is such preservative to be found in a system of education which consists in intellectual discipline and culture, though that is a different and higher thing. A well-trained mind is a thing vastly more significant and important than a well-filled mind. And yet even a well-trained mind is entirely compatible with the destructive pessimistic spirit. The forces that guard men against pessimism, the powers that breed in them hope, courage and accomplishing power, reside elsewhere than in the intellect. It is one of the curiosities of educational history that it should for so long a time have been taken for granted, that it should to so great an extent be taken for granted still, that the intellect is the principal part of man's being, and that education consists in the development and training of it. Of the intellectual and moral nature of man, joined together in intimate and mysterious union, the priority and supremacy unquestionably belong to that which is moral as distinguished from that which is intellectual. In every organism, however complex, there is always something central, that is, equally related to all points on the circumference; something radical, that is, out of which all the rest grows as from a root; something pivotal or cardinal, that is, on which all the rest turns, as on a pivot or hinge; something vital, that is, on which the life of the organism depends. Now, in man's being it is certain that this all-related and all-comprehending thing is not the intellect. Nevertheless, the belief that it is, is one of the most natural and plausible of errors. Especially may it be said that one of the peculiar dangers to which academic institutions and academic life are by their very nature exposed, is that of overestimating the relative importance of the things pertaining to the intellect

and its culture, and in a measure overlooking the momentous significance of that vast realm of man's being which, though intimately related to it, nevertheless lies outside of and beyond the intellectual part of him, being of a different constitution and nature. Just because of the greatness and splendor of the intellect, those who devote themselves exclusively to the culture of it are in special danger of falling into the error of intellect worship. It is a desolating error, as is all idolatry. No man shall, without detriment, bow down before, and give supreme homage to, that which is not supreme. Few errors are easier to fall into, and few are capable of causing more mischief, than that of supposing that the intellect is the central and dominant thing in man, and the cultivation of it the most important thing for him, and that the improvement of his intellect will be *ipso facto* the improvement of his entire being. The intellect is not supreme, but subordinate. It is a good servant, but a bad master. Like many another subordinate, it is capable of being, and often is, presumptuous, arrogant, domineering. To the intellect needs to be said, and there is a part of man's being which may justly say to it, what the Bishop of Rheims said to Clovis, King of the Merovingian Franks, at his baptism: "Bow down thy head, thou proud and haughty Sicambrian! Burn what thou hast adored, and adore what thou hast burned!"

The sovereignty in man belongs to that part of him which is moral. The primacy resides in that region of his being which we sometimes designate as "the will and the affections." It is encouraging to find that this truth is coming to be recognized more and more. It is refreshing to be told that "the psychologists have recently discovered, after directing their attention almost wholly to the scholastic operations of the intellect, that the emotions, the feelings, are fundamental in the entire life of the soul." The great enabling powers, the great motive powers, evidently lie in this domain. If education has ever been, in any sense or degree, a dis-

abling force; if it has tended in any degree to make men apathetic or pessimistic in spirit, lacking in hope and courage, incapable of decision and action, it has perhaps been largely because this important truth has been forgotten. A just proportion has not been observed, but certain faculties have been developed at the expense of others. It has been taken for granted that man's intellect is the chief thing in his vast and mysterious being, and that the development of his intellectual powers will necessarily be the cultivation and improvement of all his capabilities. Few educational mistakes could be greater than that of supposing that a cultivated intellect can be a substitute for a trained will, or of expecting that the powers and forces which make men hopeful in spirit and prompt and courageous in action, will necessarily be developed by a process which aims at exclusively intellectual culture. Nor could there be a better sign of the times, as regards matters educational, than the deep sense which many leading educators have within recent years felt and expressed of the necessity of the training of the will, and of incorporating some suitable provision for this training in every system of education.

It were an evil thing indeed if our noble institutions of learning were to give, or even threatened to give, to the land a race of frigid pessimists. So far as this evil exists, the Yale professor from whom we have already quoted is probably not far from right in indicating the cause of it. He believes this cause to lie in the fact that the process of education, being almost wholly bent on intellectual culture, has in a measure, overlooked and neglected the vast domain of capabilities and powers other than intellectual. "Can it be," he asks, "that there has been an evolution of the intellectual powers at the expense of the feelings? Have all the warm heart-beats been crystallized with cold logical processes?" He affirms that the most vital and concerning questions relating to human conduct and human welfare are apt to be treated in

the class-room "as though they pertained to the inhabitants of Mars, rather than to that living organism of which we are a part." There is no subject, indeed, however vitally it may be related to the will and the affections, which it is not possible to treat in a purely intellectual manner, and from an exclusively intellectual point of view. Some time ago, in an account, given by a resident graduate, of the state of religion at one of our great universities, it was said that one of its professors had been greatly amused by the discovery that his remarkable familiarity with the Scriptures had been taken as evidence of his being himself a living Christian. The case was far otherwise; his interest in the Bible and in the Christian religion was of a purely scientific, dispassionate, non-Christian character. To deal with such a subject in such a spirit, is, it is hardly necessary to say, not to deal with it at all. An unfeeling interest in Christianity is a spurious and sterile interest. To treat so spiritual, poetic and passionate a book as the Bible in a cold-blooded and exclusively scientific spirit, is simply to maltreat it.

It is possible, and it is one of the peculiar temptations of academic institutions, to regard the feelings as insignificant, and to leave them out of the reckoning, as not counting. Still more it is possible to regard them with intellectual scorn, to pour contempt upon sentiment and enthusiasm as being the natural and appropriate associates of ignorance, narrowness and fanaticism. Nevertheless, the feelings are the great, fundamental forces of our human nature, whether for good or evil; and it is fatal to reckon without them. The region in which motive power originates is not to be despised, however much that power may need to be directed and regulated from some other quarter. The feelings are capable of doing much harm, it is true; but, without them, what would be done at all? Enthusiasm is often associated with, or passes over into, fanaticism; but, without enthusiasm, what great thing was ever done? Are steam and electricity any the less re-

garded as great and beneficial forces because steam occasionally causes a railroad wreck, and electricity not infrequently slays those who are dealing with it? They are not rejected because they are capable of being destructive; it is only claimed that they need to be wisely directed and controlled. Thus it is with the feelings; though they are capable of being destructive, they are not on that account to be either destroyed or despised. Rather, they are to be justly governed and wisely directed, and so they are to have their share of regard in the educating process, that they may be not only preserved, but purified, trained, disciplined, and rendered capable of beneficent service. Education ought to bring a man, with all the capabilities and powers legitimately belonging to his being, to his strongest and best. The educated man ought to be capable, not only of thinking and theorizing, but also of doing; of feeling intensely, as well as seeing clearly and dispassionately. When the effect of education is to expand a man's intellect by contracting, suppressing or destroying his affections; to enrich his mind by robbing him of the power of enthusiasm; to make the man a victim of pessimism himself and a cause of pessimism in others; the circumstance of its doing so is sufficient evidence of something defective in the education. The way of true education is a very broad way; it has to do with vastly more, not only than the communication of knowledge, but more also than intellectual culture. There is something higher than a well-filled mind,—it is a well-trained mind; and there is something better than a well-trained mind,—it is a well-trained will. And there is something better than either a well-filled mind or a well-disciplined intellect, or a well-trained will. It is a thoroughly developed, disciplined and expanded personality; sound, sane, whole; in which the instincts and impulses, instead of being eliminated in the process of education, have been preserved unimpaired, purified, carried onward toward perfection, and made to fulfil the beneficent office of preserving the educated man.

from that blight of pessimism which is sometimes the curse of his class, and investing him with something of the power of hope, enthusiasm and accomplishment.

Finally, and above all, though it is barely possible to make mention here of what otherwise might well be the theme of this discourse, there is one thing which a defective system of education, blighting the feelings and paralyzing the will, may do, and may go far towards producing pessimism by doing,—it may destroy the one supreme passion of belief. Great is Belief. It is, as Carlyle says, the healthy act of a man's soul. It is the act of man's whole being, intellectual, emotional, volitional, but especially of the supreme thing in him, his will. It is this that makes man strong. "He is thrice himself who has a belief." Belief goes hand in hand with hope; the loss of it goes hand in hand with pessimism and despair.

Now, there is a type of education, and it is the type which within recent years has seemed to prevail more and more, which is sometimes indifferent and sometimes scornfully hostile towards, which is capable of being destructive of, belief. It is the kind of education which maintains the primacy of the intellect, which contends for the supremacy of logic, which holds that nothing can be known as true unless it has been proved to be true by "irrefragable demonstration." It is the kind of education which has committed itself to the principle laid down by Professor Huxley, "That it is wrong for a man to say that he is certain of the objective truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty." Let a man accept this principle, let him demand for all kinds of truth, the highest as well as the lowest, irrefragable demonstration by means of logic, and he will be an agnostic (the words we have quoted are a definition of the principle of agnosticism, as laid down by the inventor of the term), and on the way to pessimism. For it is just the highest forms of truth, those truths which above all it behooves

a man to know, and the knowledge of which makes him strong and full of hope, that are, by their very nature, incapable of a "irrefragable demonstration," in the sense in which that phrase is used by logic. That is, they are incapable, not of being known, but of being known by the mere understanding and as a result of merely logical processes. If the principle of agnosticism is sound; if there are no other capabilities and powers in the soul of man than those which are comprehended in his intellect; if logic is supreme over all, and there can be no certainty save that which it is capable of giving us; if, as regards the whole realm of spiritual truth, no knowledge is possible except that which is the result of logical demonstration before the bar of the human understanding,—then our lot must be to be forever tormented by the vain and unsatisfied longing after the unattainable; then we may well give up our beliefs and hopes and surrender ourselves to the power of melancholy and despair.

This surrender has actually been made by great numbers of highly educated men. It cannot be said that the dominant note of the type of education which has mostly prevailed in these modern times is that of hope; rather, it is that of melancholy, dejection, despondency. Whatever contributions the scientific movement of the past half century may have added to the world's store of knowledge, it cannot be said to have increased the world's stock of hope and joy. On the contrary, it would seem to have been characteristic of it to diminish the supply of these, to produce, in those who have chiefly come under its influence, a comparatively joyless and hopeless condition of soul. If it has been on the one hand an enriching, it has been on the other an impoverishing, process. If it has blessed, it has also blighted; if it has given one sort of certainty, it has taken away another and a higher; if it has increased knowledge, it has destroyed belief, with which health and hope and joy go hand in hand. It has bred agnosticism and pessimism, to the depressing and disabling

effects of which many earnest, truth-seeking agnostics and skeptics have borne mournful testimony. From Darwin down many of the chief representatives of the scientific spirit and movement have lamented the decline within them of once cherished capabilities and powers, the departure from them of old and once precious beliefs, enthusiasms and hopes. Here and there, indeed, one may be found who professes to regard this loss as being in fact a gain; but it is not so in general. The most of them speak of it in a tone of great sadness; they unite in saying, in one form or another, with Professor C. K. Clifford, "We have seen the spring sun shine out of an empty heaven, to light a soulless earth; we have felt with utter loneliness that the Great Companion is dead." One of the most brilliant representatives of the modern scientific spirit writes, passionately, of "the note of anxious, yearning, impatient, God-desiring, hungry and thirsty, exiled, foot-sore, feverish, unhappy, skepticism in the present day." He says, "Give a man possessed by this fiend one creed, throw him a mustard-seed of faith and he will remove mountains."

A defective system of education has never done its worst towards the production of pessimism until it has destroyed itself. It does not belong to the idea of education to do so; that it should ever do so, is of its weakness and not its strength, of its disease and not its health. Education has always been at its best, and always will be at its best, when going hand in hand with religion. "*Dominus Illuminatio Mea,*" "The Lord is my Light," has been, for nearly a thousand years, the motto on the coat-of-arms of one of the world's most ancient and illustrious universities. It may safely be predicted that the same in one form or another, will be, for a thousand years to come, the motto of those universities and colleges which shall be most successful in rearing and sending forth into the world a race of educated men, who, going forth into the world, strong with the strength of knowledge, but stronger still with the strength of belief and conviction, of hope, of courage, of

ardent attachment and devotion to the cause of the great King of righteousness, and truth, and love, shall be to the world as the "salt of the earth," shall preserve the age in which they live from becoming a decadent and despairing age, shall be true leaders of their fellow-men in the long-continued and ever-renewed march.

"On, to the bound of the waste,  
On, to the City of God."

HAGERSTOWN, Md.

## II.

### CHRISTIANITY AND THE FAMILY.

BY J. MAX HARK, D.D.

That we are living in a time of unusual social disturbance and unrest is a fact daily impressed upon us by our court records, newspapers, and our own observation. And the center of disturbance seems to be the family. Not only is this evidenced by the growing number of divorces, desertions, adulteries, and disgraceful cases of domestic infidelity, immorality and misery that are ventilated in our courts, but also by the scarcely less numerous frauds, embezzlements, and acts of dishonesty reported in our business life, and the equally shameful revelations of youthful crimes, of child labor, and other sins, most of which can be traced to the present condition of the family as their source.

Will it shock the reader if I make the assertion that this state of affairs, however deplorable, is but natural, almost necessary? And that Christianity itself is the occasion of it? I certainly believe this to be true; and that therein lies the ground of our hope for the future, instead of the despair which otherwise we must feel; our firm confidence and conviction that the present evils are but a temporary phase incidental to the progress and advancement of our civilization, the growing-pains, as it were, precedent to our arriving at the fulness of the stature of a perfect manhood in Christ Jesus.

Glance but a moment at the past, and the reason for this conviction will appear.

In the progress of life, even from the remotest beginnings, certain stages are marked which are epoch-making. When vegetable life had reached a certain stage of development

where it apparently could proceed no further, there appeared a new combination of forces, which resulted in a new and higher form, the lowest of animal life. It was very like the highest vegetable, yet radically different. This, growing in a new direction, becoming more and more highly organized, at length reached what seems to have been the limit of the merely animal life. Then there came another new element, a chiefly psychological one, when the first human being appeared, still very bestial, yet again radically different from the brute. Man advanced on this plane, through the savage, barbarous, semi-civilized stages, till the highest civilization was attained in the ancient Greek and Roman. Again he seemed unable to go any farther, and, in fact, began to retrograde in some directions, till in the fulness of time still another elemental principle was infused to raise man from the natural to the eternal plane. Christ the First-fruits brought this life and immortality to light. On the natural plane the principle of self-seeking, self-interest, was the animating force in the struggle for existence, leading to the survival of the ablest. On the eternal plane the principle of love and self-sacrifice was substituted. He that would save his life must be willing to lose it; he that would be greatest must be the one to serve his fellows best. A revolutionary principle, that required a readjustment of conditions and relations in every sphere of life, social, political, educational, economic and domestic; yet the only one that could save men from ultimate reversal to a lower type and the death of his essential manhood.

Now, with the introduction of this new principle to start a new progress on a higher plane of life came also the requirement to the family to adjust itself to this new principle and the conditions resulting therefrom.

First of all—without which this would have been impossible—Christianity declared all men and women to be equally free, self-determining individuals. All Christianity's commands are addressed directly to the individual. The indi-

vidual alone is accountable to God; and for his individual conduct only. Its rewards and punishments are promised to each individual. It treats only with individual souls. And, moreover, under its régime "there is neither Jew nor Gentile, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female." Woman is man's equal in dignity and responsibility.

How was the family ever to adjust itself to so radical a denial of all existing law and tradition on the subject? Especially in respect to woman's being thus made the equal of man in her individuality, the family as it was in the pre-christian, natural, state was simply an impossibility.

Though in quite primitive times the man's will had everything to do with marriage, and woman was his natural prey, to be captured, trapped or secured as his wife in trade, she having not the slightest will or voice in the matter; in later, civilized times, among the Greeks and Romans, when the family was the unit of society, marriage was not primarily a matter concerning either of the parties to be married, nor to be determined by them in any way. Their feelings and wishes were only of secondary importance—scarcely even that. First and foremost it was a family affair; and the interest and advantage of the two families to which the man and the woman belonged were the prime consideration, often the only one regarded. And as far as the woman was concerned, her wishes were never considered. She was absolutely at the disposal of her father. So that there was substantial truth in the complaint of the woman whom Sophokles causes to declare, "When we are grown up, we are driven away from our parents and paternal gods," and Hermione, in Euripides, but states a prosaic fact when she says it her father's business to provide a husband for her. Nor did woman resent this subordination. She accepted it as her natural estate. She knew nothing else than that until marriage her duty, loyalty and affection belonged to her family. Antigone, when confronted with the choice between death and loyalty to her brother Polyneikes,

on the one hand, and life and union with her lover Hæmon on the other, unhesitatingly chooses the former; not that she loves Hæmon less, but that she feels the ties binding her to her family, as represented by Polyneikes, to be stronger and more sacred. This she herself explains:

“ Am I asked what law constrained me thus?  
I answer, had I lost a husband dear  
I might have had another; other sons  
By other spouse, if one were lost to me;  
But when my father and my mother sleep  
In Hades, then no brother more can come.”

Nor was woman's condition improved by marriage. From being a mere slave and drudge in the days of savagery, she never was allowed to be more than a legal nonentity even in the palmiest days of Rome. As wife she could not own any property, nor conclude any bargain, or transaction of any consequence, on her own account; nor, of course, could she bequeath or inherit anything. Not even her relationships were acknowledged; her parents were no kin to her children, and had no social or legal connection with them other than with any strangers. She belonged to her husband, was owned by him, like any mere piece of property. He could say of her with literal truth what Petruchio boasted of his wife:

“ She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house,  
My household stuff, my field, my barn,  
My horse, my ox, my ass; my anything.”

And she herself would have humbly confessed, with the thoroughly tamed Katherine, that

“ Such duty as the subject owes her prince,  
Even such a woman oweth to her husband”;

or with Mother Eve, or at least with Milton's report of her avowal to Adam:

“ What thou biddest  
Unargued I obey; so God ordains:  
God is thy law; thou mine: to know no more  
Is woman's happiest knowledge, and her praise.”

To this inferior, abject creature now came the message of emancipation from the tyranny of family, father and husband. It was a call to a different, higher plane of life. Christianity said to her: "You are a free, self-determining person. You belong to no one, but to yourself. You have the same rights as an individual that man has. For you Christ died as much as for him. Your destiny is in your own hands; and the responsibility is yours alone." Is it a wonder that women flocked to Him who taught this "as one having authority"?

But, alas, before the full significance of this message could be realized, ecclesiasticism again obscured it, and for many centuries more kept woman practically in her old condition of willing inferiority. It is true that feudalism with its artificial chivalry after a while and for a time raised her to a seemingly more exalted estate. But it was only a false glamor of sentimentality that it threw around her. It dressed her up as a doll, and played with her; but it did little to restore her Christian rights and her self-respect. She still existed only for man. It was not till the Protestant Reformation reiterated the cardinal truths and restored the spirit of Christianity that woman's true status under Christ was again clearly and generally revealed, and she again became a recognized individual. It is owing to the rediscovery of this in such comparatively recent times that the readjustment of the family and its relations, which it demanded, is still so imperfect, and that we are even now in the very midst of the unrest and disturbance which so radical and far-reaching a process naturally must bring about. This is what was meant when it was said that Christianity was the occasion of the present social unrest. We are experiencing the growing-pains incident to the family's progress from the lower, natural, to the higher, eternal plane. The whole and sole significance of the prevalent domestic troubles, infidelities, "incompatibilities," divorces, the very general marital troubles and moral laxity, with all their concomitant sins and crimes and misery, is this: woman is just beginning to understand, in part at

least, the significance of Christianity's teaching for her as related to the family. From having for ages been denied the rights of a free individual, she is now called to their full enjoyment. And this sense of liberty is intoxicating not a few, and making them lose sight of the solemn responsibilities and new duties which come with the rights and the liberty. From having for ages simply been taken, appropriated, in marriage, she now can give herself or withhold herself as she chooses. The power of choice is so new that she often does not know how to use it wisely. From having had no will whatever as a wife, she now has the right of free will; and she sometimes mistakes willfulness for it. From having known little of help, consideration and companionship in the family, or of anything but child-bearing and nursing, she now not infrequently refuses the cares of motherhood altogether, demands idleness and luxury, and insists on social excitement and dissipation. The novelty of the whole thing is too much for some. They have lost their equilibrium. This tendency to go to opposite extremes is mighty. It is natural. But it is only temporary.

In the same way man has not yet become fully used to the fact that he is not a master over woman. There are not a few who cannot get rid of the idea Milton had, that

"God's universal law  
Gave to man despotic power  
Over his female in due awe,  
Nor from that right to part an hour,  
Smile she or lower."

The husband sometimes forgets that his wife has inalienable and sacred rights as well as he; that he has duties to his children as imperative as her's; that his being muscularly stronger than she does not make her his inferior; and that he is in no sense more important in the family than is the wife. This, too, is natural; and also but temporary.

Just as soon as both man and woman shall adapt themselves to the new conditions, made inexorably necessary by the

change in their mutual relations as individuals, and their relations over against the family, so soon the trouble and evils we now deplore will grow less and less; though they will never vanish entirely so long as selfishness and sin have a place in the human heart and human society. They will certainly never grow less by lamenting, as some do, the increasing individualism of woman. In the first place, this will never be changed; so laments are useless. In the second place, it is not the cause of the unrest. The cause is our slowness to accept the situation and adjust ourselves to it. Woman's individuality is her divine right. It has come to her in the regular course of God's development of the human race. Christianity revealed it. It is man's and woman's duty to cherish it, guard it jealously, and perfect it as a sacred trust.

Both of them suffer loss, and the family is weakened, when, either through the masculine habit of dominance, or through the feminine habit of dependence and submission, or from any other cause, the woman's newly given individuality is surrendered. The family needs two minds, two wills, two distinct natures, to fulfill its functions properly and with the greatest efficiency. If the one is so dominated by the other as to be absorbed by it, there is a positive loss of power and value to the family. There are the resources of, practically, only one mind, the strength of only one will, where there might and should be those of two. The man loses in manliness if his wife allows herself to be virtually obliterated. He needs the reënforcement of her separate and positive individuality; he needs her thought, her counsel, her encouragement or restraining influence, her resourcefulness, her inspiration, to bring out what is best in him; just as much as the woman needs this same coöperation on the part of her husband, in order that her fullest womanhood may be properly developed. And the family needs the two, or it will be onesided and weak. Especially do the children need both—a strong, positive father, and equally a strong, positive mother, two distinct parents, the balance of two distinct influences, the masculine and the

feminine, for the symmetrical moulding and even guidance of their lives.

With the recognition of woman's individuality, and equal rights and responsibilities, by Christianity, the pre-Christian basis of the family at once became an impossibility. No free woman would submit to the indignity of being sold or bought into marriage by another. She would give herself, or not, as she chose, not as her parents or family decreed. She alone had the right of disposal of herself. And no free woman would consent to be a wife under the conditions that prevailed before her emancipation by Christ. A new basis was required for marriage on the Christian plane of life. And this basis Christianity supplied, the basis of the mutual love of a man and a woman, voluntary, unconstrained, as of two equally free, self-determining individuals.

This was something absolutely new and unknown before Christianity introduced it. It was brutal strength, inflamed by the mating instinct, that impelled the earliest savage to seize his club and go forth on the hunt for a wife; and the same strength and courage that maintained the integrity of his family. An eye for the advantage of the family afterwards perhaps led him to increase the number of his wives, that he might have numerous sons to fight for him, and more women to work for him and increase the riches and power of his family or tribe. Later family interest became the sole basis of marriage. It remained such in the most advanced civilizations of the natural life. Some authorities maintain that "there is no instance of an Athenian falling in love with a free-born woman, and marrying her from violent passion." Thought this is undoubtedly an exaggeration, still it is true that the love of a young man or a young woman was never recognized as in itself a sufficient ground for their marriage. Indeed, at least the woman's wishes, inclinations, or feelings, were never considered at all. She had no voice in the matter whatever. She had no recognized individuality. She was a property only. She knew nothing, and could do nothing,

but obey. Strictly speaking marriage was no voluntary union of two persons at all; because the one party, at least, was no person legally, and had no right of volition in the matter. And after marriage the husband asked nothing more than implicit obedience. Love in any true sense of the word was neither asked nor given.

What the consequences were we all know. The family was rapidly disintegrating and civilization reverting to a lower type, when Christianity came with its saving message. It said, in effect: Force, mere animal passion, desire for offspring, self-interest, ambition, advantage or profit to family or to self—all these have had their day and served their purpose. They belong to a past and lower stage of life. In the new and higher a man shall love his wife even as Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it; and as the Church is subject to Christ so shall the wife also be subject to her husband.

Here is not only a new basis for the family, but a new kind of love for that basis. "As Christ loved the Church!" The very sublimation of love! Desire is in it, but as far removed as possible from any consideration of selfish advantage, gain or pleasure—desire for the greatest good and happiness of its object. No thought of benefit to self—but longing to benefit its object by denial and sacrifice of self even unto death. Its very essence is self-devotion, a giving, a pouring out, of self. A love that has no kinship to any mere weak sentimentality; but is strong to bear any burden for the loved one; forgiving to the uttermost; is longsuffering and patient; and which never faileth, nor ever asks any return. Such is the love of Christ for his Church. To be subject to such a love in her husband is the wife's right and greatest blessing. It makes him her own to cherish. It gives herself to him, to be crowned and exalted in the giving. She surrenders herself, only to be enriched by the possession of new rights and greater powers; the right to share his failures and his triumphs, the power to become his strength in weakness and his comfort in

sorrow, the right and the power and the glory of joining with him in renewing the life of both in their children. In such mutual love of two persons there is no loss of individuality in either; but a gain for both. It is not the substitution of the will of one for that of the other; but the joining of the two together under the common law and rule of love. And only so can be attained the complete development of a symmetrical, harmonious, blessed manhood and womanhood, through the perfect satisfaction and fulfillment of the divinely implanted functions of each. Neither can do it without the other; and neither by interfering with the other; but each only by free and spontaneous coöperation with the other.

"And so these twain, upon the skirts of Time,  
Sit side by side, full-summ'd in all their powers,  
Dispensing harvest, sowing the To-be,  
Self-reverent each and reverencing each,  
Distinct in individualities,  
But like each other ev'n as those who love.  
Then comes the statelier Eden back to men:  
Then reign the world's great bridals, chaste and calm,  
Then springs the crowning race of humankind."

In order to this is the home, the one spot on earth where man and woman may meet, and each freely, fully exercise the rights of each, as a self-determining individual; and by fulfilling the law of their own being, both also fulfill the law of their God. It was utterly impossible for the family as constituted in pre-Christian times. It is possible, and will be actual, on the higher plane of the new life revealed by Christ. Yes, it is already being realized in thousands of homes to-day. For despite the refusal of so many to adjust themselves to the law of the higher life, or their willful reversion to the old, natural basis of the family, with the sad results daily being flaunted in our faces by the papers, there still are multitudes of peaceful, happy homes throughout our land, built on this pure, Christ-like love, and enjoying the fruits thereof; multitudes of marriages which are not failures, and therefore not exploited nor illustrated by the press. And their number is

growing from year to year, as men and women are being taught by experience that "the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life," and the world is learning to appreciate the beneficent inexorableness of divine law.

I believe that there are fewer loveless marriages contracted in our day than there ever were in the past. It is comparatively seldom that a man and woman marry purely from self-interest, for money, or position, or a title. It is seldom that there are not enough elements of real love present in time to grow into that complete mutual self-devotion upon which the family can permanently stand. The trouble usually comes from the fact that after marriage so many other interests are allowed to enter into the lives of husband and wife, or of one of the two, that love dies of starvation and neglect. For love is a sensitive plant at first, and needs watching, guarding and cherishing all through life. This is its charm, that it is capable of infinite growth, unfolding new beauty of bloom, and revealing ever fresh surprises of sweetness, from year to year. And this, too, is its danger, that if not nourished daily, by offerings of unselfish attention, consideration, helpfulness and absolute confidence, omitted oftener through thoughtlessness than evil intention, it will never attain to the strength of a ripe maturity. It is the lack of these at first, followed by mutual impatience, want of forbearance, and unforgivingness, that oftener than anything else undermines the basis of the family, and leads to unhappiness, misery, separation and divorce.

Here again is revealed the ill adjustment of our social and economic conditions to the demands of the family. It should not be necessary for the business man to give his time, except the nights, and all his thought and attention, to his business; to be absent from his family from early morning till evening; to become practically only a visitor at his home, and a stranger to his children. Nor should it be required of the wife to seek rest and companionship away from her home and her husband; see him only one day in seven for months at a time;

divided from him not only in space, but in thought and interests as well. Such conditions are not conducive to the growth of mutual devotion. Love in order to grow stronger with time must be allowed to have at least some fair proportion of the loved one's society, to share his thoughts and feelings, his interests, his plans, his anxieties and his burdens. Indeed participation, in hardships and in pleasures, is the chief nourishment of wedded love, and essential to its permanence.

Our sons and daughters, moreover, need to be impressed with this fact before they leave the home of their parents to found homes of their own. It is not essential to their happiness that they should have the same luxuries they always had. Love can live and thrive without luxuries. But it cannot live without perfect mutual confidence, intelligent mutual sympathy, and real participation in the loved one's every experience, inner and outer. It is a mistaken kindness for the husband to wish to spare his wife the worry and anxiety he suffers in the course of his business. It is her duty and great privilege to share them with him. And it is a shortsighted diffidence for the wife to withhold from her husband the vexations and perplexities of her household affairs on the ground that he has too many other, more important matters to think about and to trouble himself with. Sharing in each other's unpleasant experiences and adversities is perhaps even more essential to the life and growth of love than is the sharing of pleasures. It is not so much what we share, however, that counts, as the fact of the sharing itself. This is of the very essence of true love. Love dies if denied it. And with love dead, there can be no family life.

Until there shall be a better adjustment worked out in our family, economic, and social relations to one another, we cannot hope for any great improvement in the stability of our marriages. So long as the family is not recognized as the heart of our whole social system, the very center of its life, around which all other interests must range themselves, and to whose requirements they must defer, instead of making it

subservient to money and money-getting as the center, so long we must look for a continuance of the domestic troubles and unrest from which we are now suffering so sorely. No discussing and deplored of the "divorce evil," no revision of our divorce laws, none of the legal remedies proposed by Church or State, will cure the evil. They touch only one of the outer manifestations, one of the superficial symptoms, of it. The numerous divorces of our times are not themselves the evil, but only a result of the evil. We reach the true cause of it only when we realize the lack of right adjustment between the family and the various other relations of our complex civilization. There is where the root of the trouble lies. That is what is responsible for the conditions which weaken and so often destroy the love that is the only basis on which the family can be founded and continue to exist on the higher, Christian, plane of life. Love, love like that wherewith Christ loved his Church, is the only divine bond of union between husband and wife. Whatsoever loosens or weakens this love, helps to put asunder what God has joined together.

But Christianity not only constituted the family anew, and furnished a new basis for it; it also gave entirely new and higher functions to the family when its new basis was declared.

While the family was the unit of society, the individual existed only for the family. Since Christianity reversed this principle, and the individual became the unit of society, the family exists for the individual. Its new function is to produce the best possible individuals. And under Christ he is the best and greatest who is of most service to his fellows; and he or she is of most service who is the most perfect man or woman.

The chief aim and ambition of man in early times was to strengthen his family or tribe. To this end his wife, or wives, had to bear as many sons as possible. To this end he

disposed of his daughters to the greatest advantage. To "be fruitful and multiply" was the family's most urgent duty. Now the chief care of husband and wife must be the perfection of the character of each member of the family; so to live themselves that the sons and daughters given them shall be the most perfect types of manhood and womanhood, physically strong, thoroughly equipped mentally, and spiritually refined, noble, Christlike, fit and worthy citizens of the kingdom of God.

Even in primitive times it was in the family that the savage learned his earliest lessons of kindness, helpfulness, gentleness; probably first through the appealing helplessness of the human infant. Unconsciously husband and wife were taught the rudiments, at least, of sympathy and coöperation; and found them to be advantageous. Now a similar training, but from different motives and for a different end, is to be done consciously in the family. Nowhere else can it be done as well, if at all. If no longer the unit of society, yet is the family the heart of the social body. Its function, divinely ordained, is to supply the social units, endowed with all the gifts and graces that shall characterize true citizens of the kingdom.

The education and training must begin with the husband and wife. In the intimate relations of married life what lessons of forbearance, long-suffering, patience, endurance, forgiveness, are to be learned, and practised till each has become perfect! And not only so; but the husband is to complete his manliness by adding thereto the gentleness, meekness, and fine sensitiveness of spirit, learned from the wife; while she must grow more womanly by receiving from him more self-dependence, self-control, and a wider, more impersonal outlook,

"Till at last she set herself to man  
Like perfect music unto noble words."

I do not share Dr. Münsterberg's alarm at the impending

feminization of man. There is need of it; as there is need of considerably more masculinization of woman, before either shall have outgrown the evils imposed on them by the centuries of inequality that hampered them in the past.

If possible, even more needful and important is the education and training of the children in the family. First of all is the solemn duty of not permitting them to be born with any hereditary taint, in body or spirit. At best this can be fulfilled only very imperfectly. Our children are born to us with the accumulated tendencies derived from countless generations of ancestors, among the great majority of whom the animal nature was vastly preponderant. They come to us with all the instincts and impulses of the lower, mere natural, man subject to the law of selfishness. It is for us, in the family founded on the laws of the higher life, to draw out and nourish, and sedulously develop in them thoughts, moods, feelings, and inclinations, that make for unselfishness, sympathy, kindness, gentleness, service of others; to keep dormant as much as possible, and so weaken by disuse, every lower impulse and selfish trait; and gradually to bring them under the domination of the law of love.

Think what this means! And then think of the sinful folly, the insanity, of presuming to shift this obligation upon hired nurses, governesses and schools! It belongs to the family. It can be fulfilled nowhere else but at the mother's breast and on the father's knee. The character whose training does not begin in the cradle, and is not nurtured in the pure atmosphere of a loving home, by the watchful care and prayer and constant example of father and mother combined, can hardly be saved for the kingdom of God afterwards.

Nor do the parents' duties grow less after the children have left the nursery. To the character-transfusion from parent to child which there should have gone on, must be added the conscious guidance of the child's thoughts and feelings, the cultivation of its tastes, moral and spiritual, and of its habits, until the rudiments of right principles are formed. This

demands the more or less constant and intimate companionship of father and mother. Every child has a right to as much of the parents' time and society as is necessary to win its affectionate confidence and trust. The parent needs to get into closest spiritual touch with each child; must learn to apprehend its childish point of view, so as not only to be able to understand and sympathize with it, but to make the child feel that it is understood. This is by no means an easy duty. But it is worth all the time and trouble it may cost, for the child and the parent. The wrong that is often done a child, quite unintentionally and unconsciously, by the father's or mother's ignorance of its mental attitude, and the pain thus caused, are cruel, and sometimes tragic in their effects on the character—as cruel and harmful as were the old barbarous methods of training by beating and maltreating. The father who cannot share in his boy's sorrows and pleasures, robs himself of one of the greatest privileges and joys of life. And the mother who meets the sensitive quiverings of her daughter's dawning soul with nothing but indifference or ridicule, deserves to be childless. Finally, every child has a right to the best mental culture and training that can be had. No circumstances imaginable may deny him this. It is a crime against him and against society to withhold it from him for any reason. This fortunately is coming to be recognized more and more by everyone, and need not be dwelt upon here. But the complexity of our modern life, and its many demands upon men and women, threatens to rob our children of that earliest, and far most important, training of the sensibilities, the conscience, and the will, without which the later, merely intellectual, culture may become a hindrance and a menace, to the home and to society alike, rather than a benefit.

Is it impossible for the modern mother to fulfill her duty in this respect and also attend to her many and various "social duties," her clubs, and committees, and societies, her teas and parties? Perhaps it is. But then the latter cannot be

real duties. They may be neglected without fatal results to her or to society. The former cannot. So perhaps it is true that the modern business man cannot do his work as his business requires and at the same time fulfill the family functions which his fatherhood demands. He must neglect one or the other, his business or his children. Can he hesitate between them? That such choice is made necessary, however, only proves how imperfectly our social, economic and domestic relations are adjusted to the laws of the eternal life and to one another. All we can do, apparently at least, is not to lose time in lamenting or denouncing, but to use our best efforts to hasten their proper adjustment, and make possible what God demands, what must be done, if not through us, then in spite of us; because forward and upward is the only direction in which life extends. Extinction lies in the other. Straight and narrow indeed is the one way; and broad the other,—as yet. So that the wonder is not that so many go to destruction by remaining on the natural plane of life, but rather that the number of those who attain to the eternal is not smaller. For, let us never forget that, in spite of the sins and the scandals, the crime and misery, which we cannot escape seeing around us, there still "remaineth a remnant" of families in the world, clean and pure and good, and strong enough not only to keep our modern life from ultimate reversion, but daily to swell "the stream of tendency that makes for righteousness," by daily sending forth into it men and women "thoroughly furnished unto every good word and work," fathers and mothers, sons and daughters, all children of God, filled with his life, obedient to his law of self-sacrificing, saving love.

And yet all this training is but a part of the means to the greater end, the fulfillment of which is the family's highest function. If the repeated characterization, in the Scriptures, of God as our Father, of Christ as the Son and the Bridegroom, of Christians as brethren, and the body of believers as the Bride of the Son—if this is anything more than poetical

symbolism, does it not mean that God reveals himself and his relation to us, as well as our relations to him and to one another, in the human family? And does it not mean, too, that the consummation and completion of the eternal life is to be the entrance into the intimate relationships of the family, with God as Father and ourselves as his children?

We are to learn to know him, his very nature and being, through our experience in the human family. The family is to be the interpreter of God and of ourselves to us and to our children. This makes it the most sacred of all institutions, and parentage the holiest priesthood. Again think what this means! My children are to learn to know their heavenly Father through their knowledge of me! I am better to understand his divine Fatherhood by my own experience as a father! The husband's relation to the wife is to show forth a Savior's love; and her devotion to her husband is to explain to both the mystical union between Christ and his Church! O, sacred trust! O, holy office! What parent can accept it without fear and trembling? How can any enter into it unadvisedly or lightly? The responsibility is too great, supreme as the honor and dignity with which it invests the family and every member thereof.

When we remember to what an extent even our purely intellectual activities are influenced, and our rational conclusions biased and colored, by the earliest impressions of our childhood, and then consider what inadequate interpreters God has in even the best of us, it goes far to account for much of the unspiritual crudeness, much of the error and wrong, with which popular theology has been burdened; and still is, for our earliest impressions are the deepest and most enduring. Every time that anger, ill temper, impatience, invade the family; whenever doting fondness interferes with loving justice; when fear rules, impulse governs, or discord reigns, the image of the divine Father and his relation to his children is blurred and distorted just so much in the minds of the members. No wonder our theology—and not only our popular theology—

has been so long in dethroning the heavenly tyrant, after its century-long efforts at flattering, bribing and bargaining with him, not for justice, but at least for indulgence! No wonder the Church herself became a despotism, with her princes and potentates, her councils and synods and creeds, lording it over her slavish subjects! It was but the natural extension of the lessons learned in the family to the sphere of the divine.

And such extension in itself is not only legitimate, but seems to be part of the divine purpose. The consummation of the eternal life may lie in the completion and perfection of those relations for which we are being trained in the family. The home may be the vestibule of Heaven. Our liberty, with its individual rights and responsibilities, which we find so hard to adjust now, will then come to a perfect equilibrium, and give us peace such as the world cannot give, "the peace of God which passeth understanding." When that love which now is the bond of union between husband and wife, shall have been deepened and broadened, and fully purged of every element of selfishness, it may bear its ripest fruit in the mystical union between the heavenly Bridegroom and his ransomed Bride. Then will there be no obstacles of flesh to obscure our vision of the Father, when we shall know him even as also we are known; no hindrances in our hearts to our acceptance of his Fatherhood, and the free and spontaneous outgoing of our filial affection in the joyous cry: "Abba, our Father!" All that we are learning now, so slowly, and practising so laboriously, will then have become natural, habitual, the glad expression of our perfected being. It seems as if it would be in accord with all that we know of the divine progress if at last the kingdom of God should itself be resolved into the family of God. Just as, after we had had the schoolmaster of the Law, with its commandments graven on stone, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ, and wrote its laws upon our hearts, so, mayhap, the time shall come when crowns, and scepters, and thrones, will be done away, and we shall witness the ultimate and eternal triumph of divine

love in the fulfillment of the Son's prayer "that they all may be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us"; and shall celebrate the union at the great marriage supper of the Lamb slain for us from the foundation of the world. Then shall be the final glorification of the Family, when, free from all physical limitations, its spiritual relations shall extend from earth to Heaven, and be expanded to include in their embrace all men as brethren, and God himself as the one Father of all.

MORAVIAN SEMINARY, BETHLEHEM, PA.

### III.

## THE EARLY CATECHISMS OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROF. WM. J. HINKE, PH.D.

A sketch of the early catechisms of the Reformed Church in the United States would hardly be complete without an accompanying account of the more general subject of catechisation. The two are so closely interwoven that it is best to treat them together. I shall, therefore, widen my subject so as to include a sketch of our catechetical history.

There are several aspects of my subject which I wish to emphasize by way of preface. In the first place, our catechetical history has been thus far an unwritten chapter, in the history of our church. All our historians<sup>2</sup> have passed by this interesting subject with some general remarks, without attempting to give any details. This was no doubt due to the lack of material. There seemed to be no tangible evidence upon which to construct a trustworthy history. Hence silence was the best policy. In attempting to open up this

<sup>1</sup> Read at the Spiritual Conference, held at Asbury Park, N. J., August 4, 1908.

<sup>2</sup> See L. Mayer, History of the German Reformed Church, printed in Winebrenner's History of all the Religious Denominations in the United States, Harrisburg, 1848, p. 303 f.; E. V. Gerhart, The German Reformed Church, a monograph reprinted from the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of January, 1863, pp. 1-78, see especially pp. 20-23; Dubbs, Historic Manual, p. 256; Dubbs, The Reformed Church, German, in Vol. VIII. of American Church History Series, p. 333; Dubbs, The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania, p. 269; Bomberger, The Fortunes of the Heidelberg Catechism in the United States, in the Tercentenary Monument, Chambersburg, 1863, pp. 519-541. The last was not known to me when I wrote my sketch. Many of its statements need correction, while none add anything material to our knowledge.

subject, my sketch will probably suffer the fate of all first efforts in a new field. It will be far from exhaustive and will aim to give only provisional statements of that which has actually come under my personal observation, leaving it to future investigations to follow up the lines of development which I shall indicate. In the second place, let me say that this apparently barren subject, upon closer examination, has turned out to be so fruitful, covering an area so wide and ramifications so numerous, that I despaired of giving you an adequate account of the whole story, but was compelled to limit myself to the first hundred and forty years, from 1710-1850. Even in this part of the general subject I can only indicate some of the results of my study. You will not consider this statement extravagant, when I tell you that during the last eight years I have collected about 100 different editions of Reformed catechisms in this country, and that about 150 editions are known to me from 1742 to the present time. Indeed, instead of being a subject on which there is no literature, it has turned out to be the *one* subject on which, comparatively speaking, more literature has been produced by our ministers than on any other subject. But in view of the small value attached to catechisms and the insignificant form in which they were published, it is not surprising that our early catechisms have been scattered to the four winds. It was only by long and persistent efforts that they have been partially gathered together to tell us their story. Let me say in the third place, that my studies of these relics of the past have convinced me that some of the current views about our early catechetical history are found to be entirely wrong. I select one, not because I wish to find fault in any way, but because I believe that it is the best representative of the current opinions, which were based more upon internal consciousness of what ought to have been the case, than upon any actual evidence. At the meeting of Eastern Synod in 1897, in one of the addresses delivered in commemoration of the Sesqui-Centennial celebration of the Synod, the state-

ment was made,<sup>3</sup> that the Heidelberg Catechism was so completely neglected by our early church, that it was only through the founding of our Theological Seminary in 1825 that our catechism regained the position which it ought to occupy in our church. This statement, as we shall presently see, must now be so modified as to read, that during the whole Cœtus period the position of the Heidelberg Catechism was supreme and almost uncontested, but that beginning with the year 1804 and continuing throughout the following decades, up to 1863, the year of the Tercentenary Convention, the use of the Heidelberg Catechism was more and more discontinued and, in spite of the influence of the seminary, other catechisms were introduced, which largely superseded the Heidelberg Catechism. The remarkable thing in our catechetical history is, that our early ministers, no less than their successors of to-day, regarded themselves as amply qualified to improve upon the labors of Ursinus and Olevianus. The result has been a steadily increasing number of catechisms, good, bad and indifferent, all intended to improve the catechetical training of the Reformed youth.

Divesting ourselves, therefore, as much as possible from all preconceived opinions, let us begin the study of our catechetical history upon the basis of unquestioned contemporaneous documents.

For the sake of clearness, I shall divide the subject into three parts. First, the catechisms in the period before the Cœtus 1710-1747, second, the catechisms during the Cœtus

<sup>3</sup> See Sesqui-Centennial Addresses, Philadelphia, 1897, p. 36 f., especially the statement, p. 36: "The efforts made from 1817-1825 to establish a Theological Seminary were contemporaneous with the revival of interest in the Heidelberg Catechism. It is a fact requiring distinct notice that from 1747 until 1819, a period of 72 years, neither the minutes of Cœtus, nor the minutes of Synod, make any reference either to this final Catechism of the Reformed Church of the 16th century or to any other confession of faith." The facts collected above show plainly how unsafe it is to base sweeping statements on the absence of all evidence, which may come to light at any time and upset all our inferences.

period, 1747-1793, and third, the catechisms during the early Synodical period, 1793-1850.

#### I. THE CATECHISMS IN THE PERIOD BEFORE THE COETUS.

Among the books most frequently brought to the New World by the early immigrants were the Bible, the hymn book and the catechism. The last was usually a part of the hymn book. In the accounts of the first large exodus of Germans to England in 1709 and 1710, usually spoken of as "the great exodus of 1709," we find the first reference to a catechism. More than 15,000 Palatines were at that time encamped on Black Heath near London, most of them being members of the Reformed Church, as the partial lists preserved in the Public Record Office in London prove. Many well-disposed gentlemen, physicians, merchants and others formed a committee to assist these unfortunate strangers. They arranged to have prayers read to them once a day and secured the assistance of the pastor of the Prussian Court Chapel to conduct the divine service. One of them wrote to Hamburg for 1,000 German New Testaments and Psalms in prose, in quires in the Long Primer for use of the Palatines. "Lastly they agreed that it should be taken into consideration, how to form a proposal to the government for applying the Queen's allowance to support five hundred Palatine children, from the age of six to twelve, at a charity school, in order to be instructed to write and read English, to *be taught their catechism*, to cast account, and to work on the Linnen Manufactures, etc."<sup>4</sup>

When the first congregations were organized in Pennsylvania in 1725 by the Rev. John Philip Boehm, the Heidelberg Catechism promptly made its appearance. In the constitution, which was at once drawn up by Boehm and adopted by the congregations, the following statement occurs:

"§ 10. The office and duty of the minister shall be to preach the pure doctrine of the Reformed Church, according to

<sup>4</sup> See Diffenderffer, *The German Exodus to England in 1709*, Lancaster, 1897, p. 153.

the Word of God; to administer the seals of the covenant, at the proper time and place; to hold strictly to the Confession of Faith (the Belgic Confession) of the Reformed Church; regularly to expound the *Heidelberg Catechism*; to catechise (the children), and, in conjunction with the elders, to exercise discipline.”<sup>5</sup>

In answer to the request of the consistories of Boehm to have him ordained, by the Reformed ministers of New York, the Classis of Amsterdam granted the ordination asked for, but laid down the condition “that this ordination shall not be performed before the said Boehm has declared before the ministers of New York, that he accepts the Heidelberg Catechism and all the other Formulse of Concord, and that he will direct his ministry in accordance therewith, and that he submits to the ‘church order’ of the Synod of Dort.”<sup>6</sup>

The first printed account of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania, which appeared in Holland in 1731, contains among the rules, according to which the Pennsylvania Church was to be governed, the regulation, that “all ministers, elders, deacons and school teachers shall accept, at the beginning of their official service, and shall sign the formulas, accepted by the Palatinate Church, namely (1) the Heidelberg Catechism, (2) the Palatinate Confession of Faith, (3) the Acts of the Synod of Dort, (4) the Post-Acta of the Synod, (5) the formula of consensus.”<sup>7</sup>

When a few years later, in 1734, Boehm was called as pastor of the congregation in Philadelphia, it was only with the condition that they would accept the “church ordinances,” which had been introduced into the three congregations of Boehm and had been approved of by the Classis of Amsterdam. This the congregation agreed to do, because as they

<sup>5</sup> See Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, Vol. IV., p. 2435.

<sup>6</sup> See Ecclesiastical Records, Vol. IV., p. 2469.

<sup>7</sup> See Berigt en Onderrigtinge nopens en aan de Colonie en Kerke van Penyslvanien, p. 10. For a reproduction of the title page of this exceedingly rare pamphlet see *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, Vol. II., p. 293.

declared, "they had found after careful investigation that it was in harmony with the Word of God and involved the retention of the Heidelberg Catechism and the acceptance of all the formulas of unity adopted by the Synod of Dort."<sup>8</sup>

In the same letter in which Boehm reported this action, he declared that "none of the above mentioned three ministers (Miller, Weiss and Rieger) had been willing to submit to that church order, but had sought to live after their own ideas, and that Miller in my own hearing called the Heidelberg Catechism a work of men, adding that Christians were a free people, who did not need any head here upon earth, but that Christ in heaven was alone their head."

In another letter, written by the elders of Boehm to the Classis of Amsterdam, on January 25, 1741, they express their heartfelt thanks to God, "that he has granted us such a steadfast and faithful shepherd and teacher of the pure truth of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, who has not been contaminated by any sect or false doctrine, but has always held to the true doctrine, such as we have learnt it in the Heidelberg Catechism."<sup>9</sup>

From these references it clearly appears that the Rev. Mr. Boehm was during his whole ministry a staunch advocate, defender and teacher of the Heidelberg Catechism. John Peter Miller, who in 1735 went over to the Seventh Day Baptists (Dunkers), is the only one of the Reformed ministers before the Coetus, who did not share in the customary reverence for the Heidelberg Catechism. But in view of his eccentric position this is not surprising. As his ministry in the Reformed Church was but of short duration (1730-1734), his position hardly exerted any appreciable influence in the Reformed congregations.

There was, however, another so-called Reformed Catechism in the pre-Coetus period, which aimed to take the place of the

<sup>8</sup> Letter of Boehm, dated October 20, 1734, preserved in the archives at the Hague, catalogue number: 74, I, 17.

<sup>9</sup> Amsterdam portfolio, Letter No. 13.

Heidelberg Catechism. It was the catechism which was published in 1742 under the auspices of "the Congregation of God in the Spirit." It was the union movement by which Count Zinzendorf tried to unite all Protestant denominations into one church. The credal basis of the union was said to be the articles of the Synod of Berne of year 1532. Its creed found expression in the catechism which was published by John Bechtel and has long been regarded as the product of his pen. But the Diary of the Moravian Church, at Bethlehem, shows conclusively that the author of the booklet was Count Zinzendorf, while Bechtel was merely the editor, who saw it through the press. Under date of July 22, 1742, the Bethlehem diary states: "Then Bro. Andr. Eschenbach and Gottl. Buettner read from the catechism for the Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania, which Bro. Ludwig [Zinzendorf] wrote and Bro. Bechtel edited." This is really all that the title of the book<sup>10</sup> claimed and was well known to its contemporaries.<sup>11</sup> We need not enter into a discussion of its contents except to say that, although fervent in spirit and full of practical Christianity, it was doctrinally a colorless state-

<sup>10</sup> The title reads: *Kurzer Catechismus Vor etliche Gemeinen Jesu Aus der Reformirten Religion in Pennsylvania, die sich zum alten Berner Synodo halten: Herausgegeben von Johannes Bechteln, Diener des Worts Gottes, Philadelphia, Gedruckt bey Benjamin Franklin, 1742, pp. 42.* It contains the twelve articles of the Synod of Berne, held in January, 1532, and 246 questions, without any apparent plan and clear arrangement. The chief objection of Mr. Boehm to this catechism was, that it made no reference to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, that it had "not a word" to say about the creed, the ten commandments and the Lord's Prayer. See Fresenius, *Nachrichten vom Herrnhutischen Sachen*, Vol. III., p. 654. For Bechtel and the catechism edited by him see John Bechtel: *His Contributions to Literature*, by John W. Jordan, Philadelphia, 1895.

<sup>11</sup> John Philip Boehm says in his *Faithful Letter of Warning*, Philadelphia, 1742: "It is quite plain, that he [Bechtel] only shot off the bullet, which had been cast by Count Zinzendorf." Adam Gruber, long a resident of Germantown, Pa., reported, that Count Zinzendorf "intended to have a new Lutheran catechism printed, as he had published a Reformed catechism, on the Synod of Berne, with his own explanations, under Bechtel's name." (Fresenius, *Nachrichten von Herrnhutischen Sachen*, Vol. III., p. 189.)

ment, intended to win the approval of Reformed, Lutherans and Moravians alike. It never exerted any appreciable influence, although it appeared in German, English and Swedish. There is no evidence that it was ever introduced into any Reformed congregation outside of Germantown. Bechtel himself was decidedly opposed to the Heidelberg Catechism, which he attacked publicly in his sermons.<sup>12</sup>

Most of the Reformed congregations who entered the union movement of Zinzendorf were under the pastoral care of Jacob Lischy. In the church records of two of the congregations, served by Lischy, Brownback's Church in Chester County and Muddy Creek in Lancaster County, Lischy himself entered a constitution according to which these congregations were to be governed. In it occurs the following statement: "The holy Sacraments shall be believed by us and treated as is prescribed in the Heidelberg Catechism, without in the least adding thereto or detracting therefrom." Moreover in his confession of 1748, Lischy stated: "With regard to justification and sanctification, I believe precisely what is written in our symbolical books, and in the Heidelberg Catechism."<sup>13</sup>

We have now seen that the use of the Heidelberg Catechism was general in the congregations of Boehm, and that it was even accepted by most of those congregations which had entered into the union movement of Zinzendorf and had been entrusted to Jacob Lischy. It is, therefore, natural to expect

<sup>12</sup> Mr. Boehm states in his Second Faithful Warning (p. 2): "He [Bechtel] has already given up the Heidelberg Catechism, which he promised faithfully to teach at Germantown. But on the following Sunday he excepted the 80th and 114th questions, which he was not willing to teach. They were wrong (he said), for the 114th question stated, that we could not keep the laws of God perfectly. This were not true, because those converted to God could keep them perfectly and were no longer sinners. He desired that they should sign a letter written by him, in which he had set some traps for them, which, however, was not done."

<sup>13</sup> Lischy's Confession was sent to Holland by Schlatter. It is now at the Hague, 74, I., 51. A translation by the Rev. Dr. J. I. Good was published in the *Christian World* of December 17, 1898, p. 8 f.

that it was used in all other Reformed congregations. That this was really the case may be inferred from the following instance.<sup>14</sup> On August 11, 1744, an agreement was made between the Reformed and Lutheran congregations at Quittopahilla (now Annville, Lebanon County), of which the first paragraph reads as follows:

"No other doctrine shall be preached nor the sacraments be administered in any other way than only according to the pure and clear rule of God's word, to which is added on the part of the Lutherans the unaltered Augsburg Confession and its symbolical books, and on the part of the Reformed, the Heidelberg Catechism, together with its confessions." The latter included the Belgic Confession and the decrees of the Synod of Dort.

To complete the picture of the conditions before the Cœtus, a quotation may be added from a letter of Rev. Casper Ludwig Schnorr, then pastor in Lancaster, sent on March 15, 1745, to the Classis of Amsterdam. In it he writes:

"Moreover I offer a most submissive request, without wishing to dictate, for several hundred Bibles. With these, hardly all can be supplied, for there are whole families without a single Bible. Besides, I ask for a number of Hanau or Palatinate hymn books and catechetical books, of which I regard as the best the one which bears the title: "Introduction into the Secret of the Covenant of Grace by Frederick Adolph Lampe, pastor in Bremen."<sup>15</sup> It is almost needless to say that this request was not granted.

<sup>14</sup> Another case is that of the Reformed congregation at the Mill Creek (Muehlbach), Lebanon County, Pa. When a new church was built there in 1751, there were "deposited in the corner stone the Holy Bible of the Old and New Testaments, and the Heidelberg Catechism, on which documents this religion stands and is founded." See the Proclamation, written by Mr. Templemann in commemoration of this event. Translated and published by Prof. Jos. H. Dubbs, D.D., in *The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania*, p. 180.

<sup>15</sup> Letter of Schnorr, preserved in the archives of the Classis of Amsterdam, new letters No. 14.

But the Reformed congregations were not dependent upon books sent from Holland. As early as September 9, 1746, Schlatter reported: "Six or eight of the Bibles I sold, in order to use the proceeds in the purchase of catechisms for the use of the school children."<sup>16</sup> These catechisms were probably bought from Christopher Saur, in Germantown, who since 1739 was printing books and importing others from Europe. In the issue of his paper, dated January 16, 1750, he advertised Reformed Catechisms for sale: "Besides the books offered before there are also to be had large Heidelberg Catechisms with proof texts."

As to the method of catechisation, during this period, the example of Rev. Michael Schlatter is probable a typical case. In his private diary, dated December 15, 1746; he reports: "As I am now in Philadelphia and cannot proceed with my commission during the winter, I preach twice every Sunday. One Sunday in the forenoon in Philadelphia and in the afternoon in Germantown and the next Sunday in the forenoon in Germantown and in the afternoon in Philadelphia. Wherever I preach in the afternoon, I preach on the Heidelberg Catechism and after the sermon conduct the instruction of the children."<sup>17</sup>

Such were the conditions in the period before the Cœtus. Let us summarize our results. The use of the Heidelberg Catechism was practically general. There was but one congregation in Germantown where, for a short time, the union catechism of Zinzendorf, edited by Bechtel, was used. Elsewhere we find the Heidelberg Catechism even in the congregations served by Jacob Lischy, the Reformed leader in the

<sup>16</sup> See Schlatter's Diary, in Life of Rev. Michael Schlatter, by H. Harbaugh, p. 128.

<sup>17</sup> See Schlatter's Private Diary, published by the writer in the *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, Vol. III., p. 171 f. In the same diary, Mr. Schlatter recommends that the Deputies of the Synods send him several thousand copies of a catechetical book, written by his uncle, Gabriel Walser. Bibles were sent instead of these catechisms (*i. e.*, p. 169 f.).

union movement. Among individual ministers we find only Bechtel and Miller expressing objections to the catechism and Schnorr expressing a desire to introduce Lampe's Catechism. No catechisms (except Bechtel's) were printed in Pennsylvania, as far as we know at present. They were either brought to this country by the immigrants, or were imported by book dealers. Catechetical instruction was given on Sunday afternoon. In the case of Schlatter it was preceded by a catechetical sermon.

## II. THE CATECHISMS DURING THE PERIOD OF THE CŒTUS.

Shortly after the organization of the Cœtus of Pennsylvania, the Heidelberg Catechism was adopted. At the meeting of the Cœtus in 1748 the following declaration was signed by all the ministers except one:

"We, the undersigned ministers in actual service in the Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania, having appeared at the appointed Cœtus in Philadelphia, on September 28, 1748, together with the accompanying elders from our congregations, do hereby affirm that we are devoted heart and soul to the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of the National Synod of Dort, of 1618 and 1619, and that we shall unalterably hold to them, as we do hereby."<sup>18</sup>

Mr. Rieger alone hesitated to subscribe this statement. The minutes refer as follows to his action:

"Do. Rieger heartily and sincerely declared that he felt some scruples concerning the articles of the Synod of Dort, treating of predestination in the sense of Calvin and, therefore, submits this as a *casus conscientiae* to the judgment of Synod."

At the same meeting of the Cœtus, the constitution of Boehm was adopted with some modifications. It also refers to the Heidelberg Catechism.

"§ 11. It shall be the office and duty of the minister to preach the pure doctrine of the Reformed Church according to the Word of God, and to administer the holy seals of the

<sup>18</sup> See Minutes and Letters of the Cœtus of Pennsylvania, p. 40.

covenant at the appointed time and place; always to adhere to the confession of faith of the Reformed Churches and to the Heidelberg Catechism; to explain the same regularly and consecutively; to hold catechetical instruction, etc.”<sup>19</sup>

This action and constitution clearly defined the position of the Cœtus with regard to the catechism. Even Rieger, who hesitated in 1748 in joining his brethren in their declaration, signed four years later, on October 18, 1752, a statement, by which the members of Cœtus declared their readiness “to maintain with God’s help, our religion in all its order, on the foundation of the Synod of Dort, held in the years 1618 and 1619.”<sup>20</sup>

An interesting action was taken by the Cœtus on April 26, 1753: “At the same time the Rev. President (Schlatter) has been instructed to have a small catechism printed for the benefit and edification of the youth, on the same principle that last winter already, at his own expense, he had a thousand A B C books printed.”<sup>21</sup> Unfortunately we do not know whether Schlatter carried out this resolution. If he did, this catechism as well as the A B C books<sup>22</sup> have disappeared entirely, so that not a single copy has survived. The reference to “a small catechism” does not mean another catechism than the Heidelberg, but simply an edition of the Heidelberg Catechism in small size. The authorities in Holland would never have approved of another catechism without thorough examination, even though it was but an abbreviated form of the Heidelberg; nor would Schlatter’s congregation in Philadelphia have accepted a substitute. In the call, extended to Schlatter by that congregation on August 4, 1749, they

<sup>19</sup> See Minutes of Cœtus, p. 50 f.

<sup>20</sup> See Minutes of Cœtus, p. 65.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. l. c., p. 89 f.

<sup>22</sup> The first German Reformed A B C book, now known, was printed in 1766 by Christopher Saur. It is entitled: *Hoch-Deutsches Reformirtes A B C und Namen Büchlein für Kinder welche anfangen zu lernen*. Christopher Saur, Germantown, 1766, 16mo. A copy of this booklet was sold at the sale of Governor Pennypacker’s library, Catalogue, Vol. V., No. 471.

demand that "at a specified time he shall properly explain the Heidelberg Catechism and shall unalterably adhere to it."<sup>23</sup>

Other congregations imposed the same condition upon their ministers. On April 9, 1749, the elders of the congregation of Lancaster wrote to the Synods of Holland: "Regarding the office of a minister our constitution makes wholesome provision for the same in articles 11, 12 and 13. Thus we demand nothing else than that he shall perform the duties of his office on the Lord's day with a sermon and during the summer conduct catechetical instruction in the afternoon, and also that he spend festival days and other special occasions in the Lord's service in our congregation."<sup>24</sup>

Whatever the shortcomings of the Reformed ministers during the Cœtus period may have been, catechisation was not neglected by them. A few extracts from the Cœtus Minutes will clearly prove this. In 1764 Rev. Mr. Alsentz reported about Germantown: "Catechising is held in public during the week and on Sundays." At the Cœtus of 1771, "each minister was also asked whether, at the proper time, he conducted the usual catechisation."<sup>25</sup>

In his report for the year 1792, Rev. John Henry Helffrich gives the following interesting account about the method of catechisation in vogue in his congregations. He writes: "Whenever I do not preach in this or that church on a Sunday, the schoolmaster must conduct the catechisation, according to my direction, as he conducts the school during the winter. I instruct and confirm the youth twice a year, in spring and in fall; one year in one, the next in the other congregations."<sup>26</sup>

Two accounts of confirmation services have come down to

<sup>23</sup> Preserved at the Hague, 74, II., 10.

<sup>24</sup> Letter at the Hague, 74, I., 51 (20).

<sup>25</sup> See Minutes of Cœtus, pp. 227, 307. In 1768 a delegate from the congregation at Lancaster complained, that "catechisation was not held every Sunday," see Minutes of Cœtus, p. 271.

<sup>26</sup> See Minutes of Cœtus, p. 453.

us from the Coetus period. In his private record, Rev. Mr. Waldschmidt made the following entry under date April 14, 1782: "At Cocalico near Amwegs Place [Swamp Church in Lancaster County], fifty persons and 32 others communed, who, after previous instruction in the principal parts of our Christian faith, according to the Heidelberg Catechism and its doctrine, were publicly presented to the congregation on April 13, at the time of our preparatory services, and were received as members of the Reformed religion, after making their confession of faith and giving their hand as the pledge of their promise." Another account is found in the Hebron diary, about a service which took place on June 11, 1791, in the old Reformed Church at Lebanon. The writer states: "Early this morning I went to town to the Reformed minister, Rev. Lupp, who had asked me to be present at the presentation of the children, who to-day are to be confirmed and to be admitted to the holy communion. At first there was a preparatory sermon, after which fifty children were twice asked questions from the Heidelberg Catechism, which they had to answer. At this important service there was in the whole church a continuous loud weeping and the young hearts were completely carried away with it. It took six hours till all was finished."

Numerous editions of the Heidelberg Catechism were printed during the Coetus period. The following have come to my notice, although there were doubtless others.

The first German edition appeared, as far is known at present, in 1753, as an appendix to the Marburg hymn book, reprinted by Christopher Saur in that year. The catechism has no separate title page in this edition. It is simply headed: "*Heidelberger Catechismus.*" It covers nineteen pages. There are no proof texts in this edition, only the questions and answers are given. The Catechism is followed by "some short questions, which serve to explain the five principal parts of the Christian religion and should be known to every Christian." This brief outline consists of twenty questions. It

goes back to the "Short Sum," consisting of 23 questions, which is found in the Palatinate Church Order of 1585.

The first separate edition of the Heidelberg Catechism in German appeared two years later, in 1755, also at Germantown. Although no name of a printer is given, it was no doubt Christopher Saur, as no other printer is known in Germantown at that time. This separate edition quotes the scripture passages, but does not print them in full. It has several appendices, first, the short questions of the earlier edition, but now numbering twenty-two, restoring two questions which had been omitted before. Second, four prayers, morning, evening; before and after meal. Third, the so-called "House Table," consisting of scripture passages suitable to different positions in life, under twelve heads. Most of the later editions were merely reprints of this first arrangement as introduced by Saur. This small edition was reprinted in Germantown, by Saur, in 1764, later by Henry Miller, in Philadelphia, 1768; by Leibert & Billmeyer, Germantown, 1786 and 1788; by Carl Cist in Philadelphia, 1788 and 1790.

A larger edition of the Heidelberg Catechism in German, the so-called "Palatinate Catechism," with analytical sub-questions and scripture passages given in full, was first printed by Peter Miller and Co., in Philadelphia in 1762 and republished by Steiner and Cist, Philadelphia, 1777; and by Steiner and Kämmerer, Germantown, 1795. It was in duodecimo, on 286-288 pages.<sup>27</sup>

No English edition of the Heidelberg Catechism was printed in Pennsylvania, during the Cœtus period. But it is of interest to call attention to the first English edition printed by the Dutch Reformed Church of New York. On June 5, 1764, a manuscript copy of the Heidelberg Catechism, in English, prepared by the Rev. Mr. Laidlie out of existing translations, was laid before the Consistory of the Collegiate

<sup>27</sup> The Palatinate Catechism first appeared in English in 1849; The Heidelberg Catechism, translated by Rev. J. H. Good and Rev. H. Harbaugh, Chambersburg, 1849.

Church. It was examined, approved and ordered to be printed.<sup>28</sup> I have been unable to learn whether this edition appeared at once. Several years later, in 1767, the Psalms of David, in English, were printed for the use of the Dutch Reformed Church in New York,<sup>29</sup> in which the Heidelberg Catechism also appeared in English. It is the first English edition in this country which has come to my knowledge.<sup>30</sup> To the catechism is added a "Compendium of the Christian Religion for those who intend to approach the Holy Supper of the Lord." It is an abbreviated form of the Heidelberg Catechism with 74 questions. After 1830 this compendium was repeatedly reprinted in Philadelphia and after 1840 also by our publication house in Chambersburg.<sup>31</sup> This English edition of 1767 is of interest to us, because it was the version

<sup>28</sup> Taken from Minutes of the Consistory of the Collegiate Reformed Church of New York, Vol. B, p. 329. The extract was secured through the kindness of the Rev. Dr. E. T. Corwin.

<sup>29</sup> The full title of this book reads: "The Psalms of David with the Ten Commandments, Creed, Lord's Prayer etc. In Metre. Also The Catechism, Confession of Faith, Liturgy etc. Translated from the Dutch For the use of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the City of New York. New York, Printed by James Parker, at the New Printing Office in Beaver Street, 1767." A copy of this rare book is in the library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

<sup>30</sup> It was, however, by no means the first Reformed catechism printed in America. There were several earlier Dutch Reformed catechisms. In the year 1700 Rev. John Lydius published: Christelyke Religie voorgestelt by forme von Vragen en Antwoorden, etc., by Johannes Lydius, Bradford, New York, 1700. (See Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church, 4th ed., p. 587.) In 1708 Rev. Gualther Du Bois published: Kort Begryp der waare Christelyke Leere uit den Heidelb. Catech. uitgetrokken, etc. (See Corwin, l. c., p. 441.) In 1763 Rev. Lambertus De Ronde published: A System containing the Principles of the Christian Religion, suitable to the Heidelberg Catechism, by plain questions and answers, etc., 16mo, pp. 185, New York, 1763. This is the first book in the English language published by a member of the Dutch Reformed Church in America. (See Corwin, l. c., p. 418.) It is also the first Reformed catechism, in the English language, printed in America.

<sup>31</sup> On the cover of the Heidelberg catechisms printed at Chambersburg, it is advertised as follows: "Compendium of the Heidelberg Catechism, suitable for Sunday Schools, paper covers—retail price 6½ cents per copy —four dollars per hundred."

commonly used before the appearance of the Tercentenary edition.

There were but two attempts made during the Cœtus period to introduce other Reformed Catechisms in place of the Heidelberg. The first was made in 1762, by the Rev. Casper Michael Stapel, then pastor of the German Reformed congregation in Amwell, New Jersey. He republished in that year "Die Erste Wahrheits-Milch."<sup>32</sup> i. e., "The First Milk of Truth," by the famous poet and preacher, Frederick Adolph Lampe, one of the most distinguished representatives of pietism, first professor of theology at Utrecht in Holland, then pastor of the Reformed congregation at Bremen. It was a favorite catechetical book in Germany, used in some Reformed congregations along the Rhine (e. g., in Elberfeld) till recently. Stapel's edition was printed in Philadelphia by Anton Armbruester. One of the two copies known to be in existence is now in the library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. It was formerly in possession of the Rev. John Christopher Gobrecht, who bought it in 1763 for three shillings. It is interleaved and was used by Gobrecht as his notebook. This catechism was not used for any length of time by its editor, for Stapel resigned his congregation in 1764 and died in 1766. There is no evidence that it was used anywhere else.

<sup>32</sup> The full title reads: D. Fried. Adolph Lampens | In seinem Leben erstgewesenen Theologie Profes- | soris zu Utrecht, nachher aber zu Bremen, | und sehr geistreichen Dieners des göttlichen | Wortes in der Reformirten Kirchen, etc. | Mit hohem Holländischen Staaten Privilegio. | Zuerst an das Licht gekommene, und in der Hollän- | disch- und Bremischen Schulen eingeführte | Erste Wahrheits-Milch, | Für Säuglinge an Alter und Verstand | (Oder Kurzgefasste Gründ-Lehren des Re- | formirten Christenthums.) | Aufs neue nachgesehen, von einigen denk- | schei- | nenden Redensarten gesäubert, auch in etwas | vermehrt und mit der Vorrede des Predigers bey | der Reformirt-Hochdeutschen Gemeine zu An- | weil in Neu-Jersey | Dr. Caspar Michael Staples, | Unter Vor- | wissen des Ehrwürd. Pennsylvani- | schen Cœtus | Zum Druck befördert, und verlegt von Wilhelm | Klaß | Philadelphia, Gedruckt bey Anton Armbrü- | ster, in Moravian Alley, 1762. pp. 40.

Towards the close of the Cœtus period, the Rev. John Henry Helffrich used a catechism of his own in his catechetical instruction, but as it was not printed till 1826 by his son, John Helffrich, we shall defer its description until we reach it in printed form in the early synodical period.

Having come to the close of the Cœtus period, let us briefly review the results of our study. We have found that the Heidelberg Catechism was adopted by the Cœtus in 1748 as its creed. It remained during the whole period of the Cœtus the only official standard. It was first printed in German in 1753 as part of the Saur hymn book. The first separate edition followed in 1755. The first larger edition, known as the Palatinate Catechism, appeared in 1762. In the same year the Rev. Mr. Stapel introduced Lampe's Catechism into his congregation at Amwell, New Jersey. But it was only used for a few years. About 1785 the Rev. John H. Helffrich began to use a manuscript catechism of his own in his catechetical classes. Catechisation was usually held on Sunday afternoon, less frequently during the week. In the absence of the minister, the schoolmaster chatechised the children. Confirmation was preceded by a public examination and profession of faith, followed by a public reception into membership on a communion Sunday in Spring or Fall. With the exception of a few years and a single charge, no printed catechism other than the Heidelberg was in use by the children during this whole period, from 1747-1793. All editions of the catechism, that appeared during the Cœtus period, were printed either in Philadelphia or in Germantown.

### III. THE CATECHISMS IN THE EARLY PERIOD OF THE SYNOD. 1793-1850.

As soon as we reach the period of the Synod, a different attitude seems to come over the church on the question of the Heidelberg Catechism. It is apparently becoming too deep and too heavy for ministers and people. We have come upon barren times, when the rationalism of Germany, the

deism of England and the anarchy of the French revolution made themselves felt even in America. The period from 1793-1825 may well be called the darkest chapter in our history. It is the period in which most of our congregations, north and south of Pennsylvania, were lost to our church. In 1820 the Missionary Committee reported 200 charges with 30,000 communicants without the preaching of God's word.<sup>33</sup> The ministry during this period was largely self educated or had at most passed through one of the several private seminaries. It was a period of moral decay and theological stagnation. The Heidelberg Catechism proved too deep and too spiritual for this rationalistic age and, therefore, numerous attempts were made to produce catechisms which agreed more with the spirit of the age.

Yet the Heidelberg Catechism was by no means entirely set aside. This is shown by the increasing number of printers who issued numerous editions. There were during the period under discussion (1793-1850) at least six printing houses in Philadelphia, one in Germantown, one in Reading, one in Easton and one in Chambersburg, which issued Heidelberg Catechisms in German.<sup>34</sup> Further investigation may bring to light still other places. The first English edition in Pennsylvania was published by Starck and Lange, in Hanover, in 1810. Next follows an edition of 1812 by Mary Schweitzer, in Philadelphia. I have noted four firms in Philadelphia,

<sup>33</sup> See the Address of the Missionary Committee to the Members of the German Reformed Church in the United States, Hagerstown, printed by John Gruber and Daniel May, 1820, p. 4: "We think it very probable, that the whole number of vacant congregations is not less than two hundred . . . If we estimate the number of members in each congregation, including children, at no more than one hundred and fifty, we have in two hundred congregations *thirty thousand souls*; and if we compute the scattered members at five thousand, we have in the whole an aggregate of *thirty five thousand* persons, members of the Reformed church, who are living in a destitute condition, without the benefit of pastoral ministrations."

<sup>34</sup> For details and additions see Bibliography at the end of the paper.

one in Chambersburg, one in Hagerstown and one in Baltimore, which printed English editions from 1810-1850.

But more remarkable than the increasing demand for Heidelberg Catechisms was the demand for and the use of private catechisms during this period. It is unquestionably the period in which private catechisms ruled the day. The attitude of Synod seemed to favor this tendency. In the constitution of Synod, adopted in 1793 (but not printed till 1805), the Heidelberg Catechism is not mentioned. It is indeed stated (§ 8, Art. 3) that "every member of Synod shall make a faithful report (a) of the discharge of his duties, whether . . . he catechises frequently." In the appendix to the constitution, adopted May 12, 1800, catechists are directed "to preach, to hold catechetical instruction and to prepare the youth for confirmation." This seemed to leave the way open for the use of any catechism. Synod itself made several unsuccessful attempts to issue a shorter catechism. In 1793 Do. Winckhaus "promised to do something towards effecting a convenient arrangement of the catechism and also to distribute it among the members of Synod." Death prevented him from carrying out his promise. Synod took no further action till 1820, when a number of private catechisms had already made their appearance. In that year Maryland Classis sent the following overture to Synod: "Resolved that it be recommended to Synod to decide whether or not the Heidelberg Catechism shall be used exclusively in the instruction of the youth and in catechisation." Synod answered: "Resolved that the Heidelberg Catechism be used exclusively." Another recommendation of Maryland Classis was to the effect, "that Synod make a short extract, in brief questions and answers, from the Heidelberg Catechism, translate it into English and publish it as an appendix to the catechism." Synod replied: "Resolved that a committee be appointed to prepare a short and suitable extract, translate the same also into the English language and have it printed in German and English, for use in such cases where circumstances do not

permit the explanation of the whole Heidelberg Catechism; but with this condition that the committee shall not be permitted to have this extract printed before it has been submitted to Synod and has been fully approved by the same." The committee consisted of Messrs. S. Helffenstein, Hendel, Reily, Mayer and Becker. It is interesting to note that at least two of these men had catechisms of their own. In 1821 the committee reported that "for good reasons" it had done nothing. The committee was continued with instructions to do better. In 1822 S. Helffenstein reported that "the little catechism, which appeared several years ago at Carlisle, in German and English, was suitable, after some corrections had been made in it." This report was *not* adopted. This result was due to the fact that Helffenstein himself was the author of the catechism he recommended to Synod. Evidently Synod did not share the good opinion of its author. Helffenstein himself then moved that another committee be appointed to prepare a suitable extract and report the following spring to the various classes. The new committee, consisting of Messrs. L. L. Hinsch, J. Helffenstein and A. J. Helffenstein, submitted in the following year (1823) two extracts in manuscript, which were recommitted to prepare the final draught on the basis of them. In the following year the committee reported that as the manuscripts had not been returned to them, they had not been able to do anything. Synod then resolved to defer the whole subject. Thus ended the second effort of Synod to satisfy the need of a shorter catechism. Meanwhile the production of private catechisms continued uninterruptedly, in spite of the fact that in 1828 Synod adopted a new constitution, which contained an article against all these private ventures. The article reads: "In the instruction of the youth no catechism shall be used which has not been approved by Synod and ordered to be used. The Heidelberg Catechism, or an extract of it, approved by Synod, shall be used in instruction." This fundamental law of the church, which was reenacted in the constitution of 1846, always

remained a dead letter. It did not even stop the use of those Reformed catechisms which were not based on the Heidelberg Catechism at all.

The Reformed catechisms, issued by Reformed ministers in the first half of the nineteenth century may be divided into two groups. First, those which were based on the Heidelberg Catechism more or less closely. Second, those which were independent of the Heidelberg Catechism in their division and treatment.

#### 1. BASED ON THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

Those catechisms which follow the Heidelberg Catechism more or less closely, should be taken first, because they were first in actual use.

##### 1. *The Catechism of John Henry Helffrich.*

The most important of these catechisms is one of John Henry Helffrich. It was indeed not printed till 1826, but the preface states explicitly that it had been in use in the congregations of Helffrich (Heidelberg, Lowhill, DeLong's, Kutztown, Milford, Macungie and Weissenburg) for more than forty years. This carries us back to at least the year 1785. For years it was used by Helffrich in manuscript form till his son, the Rev. John Helffrich, published it in 1826 at Allentown, "at the request of many members." It is entitled: *Christlicher Unterricht der Religion. In Fragen und Antworten*, i. e., "Christian Instruction in Religion. In Questions and Answers." It is a catechism which shows considerable ability on the part of the author and was well fitted, by its short and pointed questions, 485 in all, to serve as an introduction into the system of truth as taught in the Heidelberg catechism. Following the Heidelberg, the catechism of Helffrich has five parts: First, the creed; second, the institution of baptism; third, the institution of the Lord's Supper; fourth, the ten commandments; fifth, the Lord's Prayer. These five parts are preceded by two introductory

sections, one on religion in general, and one on the scriptures. Space does not permit an exhaustive analysis. In order to characterize the book several peculiarities may be mentioned. First, questions and answers are simple, well adapted to children. The following extract may serve as an example: "What must we do, since we cannot redeem ourselves, nor any mere creature can redeem us? We must seek another mediator and redeemer. What must be the character of this mediator? He must be true man and righteous and at the same time true God. What is a true man? One who consists of body and soul. What is a righteous man? One that is without sin. Why must our mediator be a true man? Because the justice of God requires that the same human nature which has sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin (Q. 16). For what other reason must he be a true man? That he might suffer death for us. Why must our mediator be a righteous man? That he might not be required to make satisfaction for himself. Could he have been our mediator if he had not been without sin? No. Why not? Because one who is himself a sinner cannot satisfy for others. Why must our mediator be true God? That he might, by the power of his Godhead sustain, etc. (Q. 17). Do we have such a mediator who is true God and a true and righteous man? Yes. Who is he? Our Lord Jesus Christ, etc. (Q. 18). Is Christ a true man? Yes. How do we know that? Because he has a true human body and a true human soul. Is Christ also a righteous man? Yes. Whence do we know that? Because he is without sin. Is Christ also true God? Yes. Where is he called God? I. John, 5: 20." Second, as the above extract shows, the catechism of Helffrich does not dispense with the Heidelberg. The latter is supposed to be in the hands of every child. It only aims to serve as a key to the meaning of the main catechism by explanatory and analytical questions. Third, the catechism of Helffrich shows clearly the scholastic training of its author. Thus he asks: "How manifold is the providence of God? Twofold, general

and special. General, for the world and special for his church. How manifold is the evil which we have inherited? Two-fold, the evil of sin and the evil of punishment. How many kinds of sin are there? Two, original and actual. How manifold is actual sin? Twofold, sins of commission and sins of omission. How manifold is the punishment? Two-fold, temporal and eternal. In how many states did Christ carry on his mediatorial office? In two states, the state of humiliation and exaltation. How many degrees did the state of humiliation have? Four. How many the state of exaltation? Four." Such theological distinctions are numerous in the catechism. Aside from them it might well find favor with the people. This catechism passed through at least five different editions. The fifth was printed in 1852 at Weisenburg by John Helffrich himself.

## 2. *The Catechism of Samuel Helffenstein.*

Closely connected with the catechism of Helffrich is that of Helffenstein. In fact its dependence upon Helffrich's catechism is so general that the majority of its questions and answers is copied verbatim from Helffrich's catechism. As the latter did not appear till 1826, while Helffenstein published the first edition of his catechism in 1810, he must have had a manuscript copy of his uncle's catechism before him, when he wrote his own. Of the approximately 500 questions of Helffenstein at least 300 are taken from Helffrich. He was evidently not afraid of the charge of plagiarism. Wherever he departs from Helffrich it is to approach the Heidelberg Catechism more closely. Its title reads: *Kurze Unterweisung in der Christlichen Religion, nach dem Heidelbergischen Catechismus, i. e., "A Short Instruction in the Christian Religion, According to the Heidelberg Catechism."* Three editions of this catechism are known to me, the first, a German edition published 1810 in Philadelphia, second, a German and English edition printed in 1818 at Carlisle, by John McFarland,

next door to the Spread Eagle, lastly, an English edition, printed in 1829, at Philadelphia, by John G. Ritter.

### 3. *The Lebanon Catechism of 1810.*

Another catechism, which followed along the lines laid down by Helffrich and Helffenstein, appeared in 1810 at Lebanon, printed by Jacob Schnee. It is entitled: "*Zusammenhang der Christlichen Lehre nach Anleitung des Heidelbergischen Catechismi*,"<sup>35</sup> i. e., "Connexion of Christian Doctrine following the guidance of the Heidelberg Catechism." It has no preface and hence nothing definite can be said about its author. It can only be noted that from 1800-1828 the Rev. William Hiester was the pastor of the Reformed Church at Lebanon. It is, therefore, possible that he was the author, or perhaps the editor of this catechism. Whoever the author, he shows considerable ability and independence. As to the sources used by him, a detailed comparison with Helffrich's catechism shows that he was acquainted with it, either in the form as published by Helffenstein in 1810 or as found in a manuscript copy of Helffrich's catechism. A remoter possibility is that both the Helffrich and the Lebanon catechism used a common source. There are also some questions which reveal an acquaintance with Becker's catechism of 1805.<sup>36</sup>

The arrangement of this catechism is modelled after that of Helffrich. After six introductory questions it treats in eight articles of God, creation and man's fall, the redeemer, the states of the redeemer, the imparting of salvation, the holy sacraments, the ten commandments and the Lord's Prayer. It is noteworthy that in this arrangement of the material the introductory questions of the creed, as found in the Heidelberg Catechism (Qu. 3-22), are transposed to the second and third part, treating of creation, man's fall and the redeemer. The third part of the creed is but slightly touched upon. There is

<sup>35</sup> Dr. S. P. Heilman, of Heilman Dale, Pa., very kindly placed his copy at my disposal for examination.

<sup>36</sup> For this catechism, see p. 504 f.

only one question on the Holy Spirit, but none on the church, forgiveness of sins and life everlasting.

In the treatment of the material we notice that it approaches the Heidelberg Catechism much closer than either Helffrich's or Helfenstein's. There are, however, in every chapter a considerable number of independent questions. The following are some characteristic examples: "What is God? A most perfect spirit. How many gods are there? There is but one God. Could there be more than one God? No, because God is the highest being. How dost thou know that the Bible is God's word? First, by its contents, second, by its effect. What does it mean to be created after the image of God? To have the nature and mind of God. Whereby did they (Adam and Eve) sin? By eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Why was that sinful? Because God had forbidden it. What made their sin so great? Because it was so easy to keep the law. How many parts belong to a sacrament? Four parts, the external sign, the designated good, the divine institution and the assurance of salvation. What is confirmation? A renewal and confirmation of the vows and promises, which were made in our name, when we were baptized; with which is connected a solemn imposition of the hands of the minister and an imploring of the grace of God."

The catechism takes an exceptional and peculiar position on private baptism. It asks: "Whom did Christ command to baptize? His disciples. Do we have to understand all Christians by his disciples? No, but only the ministers. How do we know that? Because Jesus commanded only those to baptize whom he sent out to teach. Is any one else permitted to baptize who is no teacher? No, such a one would part what God has joined together. If no teacher is to be had, is it necessary that any one else baptize? No, because God is not bound to baptism. If we can be saved without baptism, is it then unnecessary? No, because what God has commanded is necessary. Whoever has the opportunity to

receive baptism according to the order of Christ, but refuses it, thereby despises the command of God."

The catechism closes with five questions on the only comfort in life and in death. They are introduced as follows: "What benefit do you receive when you believe and do this Christian doctrine? A true and well-founded comfort, in life and death. The catechism has in all 323 unnumbered questions. It was reprinted at Lebanon in 1818 by J. Hartmann. It is one of the best of our early catechisms.

#### 4. *The Catechism of Jonathan Rahauser.*

The next catechism which follows those of 1810, was published in 1817, by Jonathan Rahauser, minister of the gospel at Hagerstown. It was printed by Messrs. Gruber and May, in the same year in which Rahauser died. It appeared in German and English under the title: *Kurzer Auszug aus dem Heidelberg Catechismus, In Frag und Antwort, i. e., "Short Extract from the Heidelberg Catechism, In Question and Answer."* It follows the arrangement of the Heidelberg Catechism, except that it transfers the discussion of the ten commandments to the first part. It introduces also numerous questions not founded on the main catechism. Most of them are based on the catechism of Helffrich. In all there are 423 unnumbered questions. It seems to have enjoyed considerable popularity, for it was frequently reprinted. The following editions are in my possession. In 1821 it was republished at Lancaster by the Rev. Henry B. Schaffner. In 1831 at Selinsgrove by the Rev. Daniel Hertz. The receipt for \$27.00, which Mr. Hertz received from the printer, Amos Stroh, "for printing chaticise," is attached to my copy. An English edition, which was printed at Hagerstown in 1829, is considerably abbreviated.

#### 5. *The Allentown Catechism of 1820.*

Another catechism, which follows the arrangement of the Heidelberg Catechism, appeared for the first time in Allen-

town, in the year 1820, printed by Henrich Ebner.<sup>37</sup> It is entitled: *Christlicher Unterricht der Religion. In Fragen und Antworten*, i. e., "Christian Instruction in Religion. In Questions and Answers." The author is not mentioned on the title page, but its preface is dated "Whitehall 1819." The Reformed congregations in Whitehall township, Lehigh county, were Egypt, Jordan and Union. Their pastor in 1819 was the Rev. John Gobrecht. Whether he was the author of this catechism cannot be determined. He was at least the one who introduced it. After an introduction of 17 questions, this catechism analyses, like the others, a selected number of questions taken from the Heidelberg Catechism. Many of its questions and answers reproduce the Heidelberg Catechism literally, but occasionally other questions are inserted, not based on the Heidelberg Catechism. The following may serve as samples:

"Who is thy neighbor? Of how many parts does man consist? In what part of man was the image of God? What was the sin of Adam and Eve? What was the name of the tree? What is original sin? What is actual sin? What is regeneration? How did God punish the first, godless world? By the flood. How did he punish Sodom and Gomorrah? How else is sin punished temporally? By war, hunger, pestilence, sickness and death. By whom were the books of the Old Testament written? By Moses and the prophets. By whom the books of the New Testament? By the evangelists and the apostles. How are they divided? Some of these questions go back to the "Milk of Truth," by Dr. Lampe. Others can be traced to the catechism of Helffrich. The total number of questions in this apparently little catechism is 444. Later editions of this catechism were published in 1844 and 1853 by the Rev. Joseph S. Dubbs for use in his congregations.<sup>38</sup>

\* A copy of this catechism of 1820 is in the library of the German Society, corner Marshall and Spring Garden Streets, Philadelphia.

\* My copy of the edition of 1844 bears this title on the outside cover: "Zum Unterricht in den Gemeinden des Ehrw. Herrn Duba." From this

### 6. *The Catechism of John Brown.*

A mere abridgment of Helffenstein's catechism was published in 1830 by the Rev. John Brown, then pastor of the Reformed congregations in the upper part of the Shenandoah valley, Virginia. The full title of this catechism reads: *Eine kurze Unterweisung [der] Christlichen Religion nach dem Heidelbergischen Catechismus, in den Deutschen und Englischen Sprachen bey Johannes Braun, Diener des Evangelii.* "A Short Instruction according to the Heidelberg Catechism, in German and English, by John Brown, Minister of the Gospel. Harrisonburg: Printed by Lawrence Wartmann, Rockingham County, Virginia, 1830." 16mo, pp. 72.<sup>39</sup>

This catechism contains 340 unnumbered questions, of which all but two in the introduction are taken from the catechism of Helffenstein. It omits about 150 of Helffenstein's questions, many of them represent questions taken from the Heidelberg Catechism. It is curious to note that the author or rather editor fails to state his dependence on Helffenstein. Catechisms in those days were evidently considered common property, which any one could reissue at will, even under his own name.

### 7. *The Catechism of Samuel Hess.*

A more elaborate catechism on the basis of the Heidelberg was published in 1843 by Samuel Hess, V.D.M., at Easton, printed by Heinrich Held. It is entitled: *Kurzgefasster Unterricht in der Christlichen Religion, in Fragen und Antworten, zum Gebrauch der Jugend, i. e.,* "Short Instruction in the Christian Religion, in Questions and Answers, for the use of the children." It contains no less than 524 unnumbered questions. Ten questions form an introduction. The imprint it was formerly inferred that the Rev. Mr. Joseph S. Dubbs was its author, but in view of the edition of 1820 this is clearly impossible. Mr. J. S. Dubbs was not ordained till 1823.

<sup>39</sup> I was able to consult a copy of this rare catechism in possession of General John E. Roller, of Harrisonburg, Va., which he very kindly placed at my disposal.

rest follow in the main the Heidelberg, but many independent questions occur. Under the first part of the creed the author asks: What are the perfections of God? God is eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent and most perfect. Where do we learn to know God's perfections? In his works. How manifold are the works of God? Twofold. The works of nature and the works of grace. What are the works of nature? Creation and providence. What are the works of grace? Redemption and sanctification, etc. Most of the additional questions are dependent upon the earlier catechism of Helffrich. But there are also a number of questions which go back to the catechism of Jacob Christian Becker.<sup>40</sup>

#### 8. *The Catechisms of Samuel R. Fisher.*

The last of the catechisms, belonging to this class, are the two catechetical books of Dr. S. R. Fisher. The first is entitled: "Exercises on the Heidelberg Catechism for Families, Sabbath Schools and Catechetical Classes. By Samuel R. Fisher. Chambersburg, Pa. Printed at the Office of Publication, 1844." It is a book similar to the large Palatinate Catechism. Each question and answer is followed by three subsections. First, explanations of words and phrases. Second, doctrines separated and proved by scripture passages. Third, exercises, consisting of a series of analytical questions. The Synod of 1843 cordially recommended the work "as a suitable book to be used in connection with Catechetical and Sabbath School instruction." (Minutes of 1843, p. 82.)

This book was deservedly popular. A revised edition was issued in 1854 in Chambersburg, and later editions by the Reformed Publication House in Philadelphia.

The second catechism issued by Dr. S. R. Fisher, was intended for children. It is entitled: "The Heidelberg Catechism Simplified; or Introduction to the 'Exercises on the Heidelberg Catechism.' By Samuel R. Fisher. Chambersburg, Pa., Printed by M. Kieffer & Co., 1850." Its questions

\* For this catechism, see p. 506 f.

and answers are short and strictly limited to an analysis of the Heidelberg Catechism. Its enjoyed exceptional popularity, for it passed through eleven editions till 1863, and still others after that date.

There is in this series of nine catechisms, of which at least thirty different editions appeared, a noticeable tendency to approach closer to the Heidelberg Catechism. The excellency of the latter again won slowly but surely its way to recognition.

## 2. INDEPENDENT OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

The catechisms, independent of the Heidelberg Catechism, although fewer in number, nevertheless exerted a considerable influence. This may have been partly due to the fact that at least two of them were the first to make their appearance in print.

### 1. *The Lebanon Catechism of 1804.*

The first of these independent catechisms was printed at Lancaster in 1804. It is entitled: *Kurzer Inbegriff der Christlichen Lehre, nebst einer kurzgefassten Kirchengeschichte des alten und neuen Testaments, i. e., "Short Summary of the Christian doctrine, together with a brief outline of the Church History of the Old and New Testament."* Its preface is dated "Lebanon, January, 1804." This signature makes it probable that the then pastor at Lebanon, Mr. William Hiester, was its author or at least its editor. The characteristic feature of this catechism is that it has no questions, but simple statements, arranged under different heads. The material is divided into two parts. First, treating of Christian faith, second, of Christian duty or morality.

The following subjects are taken up in the eleven chapters of the first part: God, angels, man, sin, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the means of grace, Holy Baptism, the Holy Supper, the plan of salvation, prayer, death, resurrection, judgment and eternity. The second part discusses our duties in general, the duties towards God, towards ourselves, towards our neighbors, general and special duties, capping the climax

with an appendix of duties towards animals, and lastly some means of improvement. The very outline shows its rationalistic character. This appears still more plainly by an examination of the various statements. Under the duties towards ourselves, we are exhorted to care above all for our soul, to care for the health of our body, to endeavor to preserve our good name and conscience and to care for our food, clothes and well-being. It is not necessary to reproduce more of its contents except to say that it affected all the other catechisms of this group. It appeared in a number of editions with different titles. At least one edition appeared under the title: "*Kurzer Inbegriff.*" Several editions bear the title: *Hauptinhalt der Christlichen Lehre*. Two of them were printed by Jacob Schnee at Lebanon, one in 1808, the other in 1813. The fourth edition appeared in 1816 at Reading, printed by Henrich B. Sage, the fifth edition in 1821, by the same printer, and the sixth edition in 1832, printed by John Ritter & Co.

## 2. *The Catechism of Christian Ludwig Becker.*

The least systematic of all the independent catechisms is that of Rev. Chr. L. Becker, D.D., entitled: *Kurzer Entwurf der Christlichen Lehre von Dr. Christian Ludewig Becker, Lancaster, gedruckt bey Johann Albrecht, 1805, i. e.*, "Short Summary of the Christian Doctrine." In view of his other works, we expected more care and clear, logical arrangement from the worthy doctor. But in this he disappointed us. His catechism runs without visible division or logical development from beginning to end. Its chief fault lies in the fact that it does not treat of the creed, the ten commandments and the Lord's prayer. It is indeed a curious medley of questions. It begins as follows: For what purpose is man created? What must he do to be happy? How do you call that? What is the true religion? Why? What is the Bible? Upon what is religion based? What do you believe of God? How do you know that there is one God? What else do you believe

of God? What else do you believe of him? What else? Do not the forces of nature also operate, or does nothing take place without God? What is your duty? What else do you believe of God?" The questions treat of God, Jesus Christ, repentance and conversion, of the Holy Ghost, the commandments, the future life and the means of grace in general and finally the sacraments. It is remarkable that a catechism with so little logical arrangement was issued in at least five different editions, Lancaster 1805, Hanover 1808, Lancaster 1810, Harrisburg 1811 and Frederick, Md., 1813.

### 3. *The Catechism of L. F. Hermann.*

More logical arrangement is to be found in the catechism of the Rev. Lebrecht Frederick Hermann, pastor of the New Hanover congregation. The first edition was printed at Reading in 1813. It is entitled: *Catechismus der Glaubenslehren und Lebenspflichten der Christlichen Religion*, i. e., "Catechism of the doctrines of faith and of the duties of life of the Christian religion." This title indicates its twofold division. Part one treats of the doctrines of faith, part two of the duties of life. This division goes back to the "Kurzer Inbegriff" of 1804. The first part is arranged under the following heads: Religion and the knowledge of God, the sacred scriptures, the Christian religion and faith, the articles of the creed. Part two treats of repentance and good works, the ten commandments, the Lord's prayer, the sacraments and the duties of those who go to the holy supper the first time. Many of the questions reveal a distinctly rationalistic character. The following questions, selected at random, indicate plainly its tendency. "What is the highest good, which one can possess in this world? It is peace of soul and calmness of conscience. How can they be obtained? By no other means than holiness and trust in God. Is there but one God? Reason teaches us, that there can be but one God. Why did Christ have to be a man? That he might live among men and die for them. What does it mean that Christ descended into

hell? It means, according to the language of the ancients, that Christ went to the same place where all men go to after their death. How do you recognize those who believe in Christ? They confess publicly his doctrine and obey him. What is the duty of the ministers? To preach the gospel and to govern the church according to the laws of Christ and his apostles. What are sacraments? They are visible holy signs and seals, by whose right use we remind ourselves of the great work of redemption and are assured of participating in it. What is the principal duty of a Christian? To pray reverently every day, especially in the morning and evening, if he does that his heart will at all times be inclined to the good." These and similar questions leave no doubt as to its prevailing character. Four editions are known to me, Reading 1813 and 1819, and two printed in Philadelphia.

#### 4. *The Catechism of Jacob Christian Becker.*

The last of the independent catechisms before 1850 is that of Rev. J. C. Becker, D.D., entitled: *Kurzer Entwurf der Christlichen Lehre in Fragen und Antworten*, i. e., "Short Sketch of the Christian Truth in Questions and Answers." It appeared first at Allentown in 1833. It is partly based on the Lebanon catechism of 1804 and partly on that of his father. The last part on sacraments and confirmation reprints his father's catechism almost verbatim. The first three chapters treat of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit. The next three, of the duty of our love of God, the duty of self love, and of neighborly love. Under the last head it takes over quite literally the questions of the Lebanon catechism of 1804, treating of the duties of magistrates and subjects, teachers and scholars, masters and servants, parents and children, husbands and wives, etc. It shares with its predecessors, which it reproduces freely, their rationalistic and utilitarian character.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Mr. Becker submitted his catechism to the Synod of 1833 (Minutes, p. 14) for an expression of its opinion, but the committee to which it was

We cannot leave this long history of Reformed catechisms and catechetical instruction without drawing some general conclusions:

1. The Reformed Church in this country has always felt the need for catechetical instruction. Revivals have never been able to take its place.
2. The Reformed Church has never given up the Heidelberg Catechism, but it has always felt the need of a shorter book for the instruction of the children.
3. The church has repeatedly tried to remedy this defect, but thus far has not made adequate provision for a shorter catechism.
4. The mistakes of the past in the production of catechisms have mainly been in departing too much from the Heidelberg or in giving too many questions, which could not be memorized.
5. What is needed is a shorter form, not exceeding the small Heidelberg Catechism of 71 questions, officially adopted by the church of the Palatinate in its liturgy of 1585, or the compendium of the catechism adopted by the Synod of Dort, numbering 74 questions.
6. The Heidelberg Catechism itself should not be changed, but it should remain what it was from the beginning, a book of confession for grown-up Christians. For the instruction of the youth, the General Synod of our Church should prepare a shorter catechism to serve as an appendix to the larger.

In the following bibliography the author enjoyed the kind assistance of several friends, who supplied him most cheerfully with titles and in some cases with actual copies in their possession. He is thus under obligation to General John E. Roller, the Rev. Prof. Jos. H. Dubbs, D.D., the Rev. A. Stapleton, D.D., the Rev. P. C. Croll, D.D., Dr. S. P. Heilman and Mr. H. S. Heilman. Though far from exhaustive, the list is published with the hope that it may serve as a basis for future study.

referred, with several other catechisms, apparently never reported. At least there is no record of their report.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY OF REFORMED CATECHISMS.

1740-1850.

## I. EDITIONS OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

## 1. German Editions.

## Catechismus oder Kurtzer Unterricht Christlicher Lehre.

- Germantown, —, 1755, 24mo.
- Germantown, —, 1764, 24mo, pp. 94.
- Philadelphia, H. Miller, 1768.
- Germantown, Leibert & Billmeyer, 1786, 16mo, pp. 118.
- Germantown, Leibert & Billmeyer, 1788, 16mo, pp. 118.
- Philadelphia, Carl Cist, 1788, 16mo, pp. 124.
- Philadelphia, Carl Cist, 1790, 16mo, pp. 124.
- Philadelphia, Melchior Steiner, 1790.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1793.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1796.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1802, p. 118.
- Hagerstown, Gruber & May, 1803.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1804, 16mo, pp. 116.
- Philadelphia, C. Zentler, 1807, pp. 108.
- Carlisle, Fr. Sanno, 1808, 16mo, pp. 112.
- Philadelphia, G. W. Mentz, 1810, pp. 108.
- Philadelphia, Jacob Meyer, 1810, 16mo, pp. 108.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1810, 24mo, pp. 118.
- Reading, Joh. Ritter & Co., 1811, 24mo, pp. 104.
- Philadelphia, Jacob Meyer, 1812, 16mo, pp. 108.
- Baltimore, Cushing, 1812, pp. 108.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1812, 24mo, pp. 118.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1814, 24mo, pp. 118.
- Philadelphia, James Stackhouse, 1814, 16mo, pp. 108.
- Philadelphia, G. & D. Billmeyer, 1816, 16mo, pp. 118.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1816, 24mo, pp. 110.
- Philadelphia, G. & D. Billmeyer, 1818, 24mo, pp. 118.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1819, 24mo, pp. 118.
- Reading, Joh. Ritter & Co., 1822, 24mo, pp. 104.
- Reading, Joh. Ritter, 1826, 24mo, pp. 104.
- Easton, H. & W. Hüttner, 1826, 24mo, pp. 101.
- Philadelphia, C. Zentler, 1830, pp. 108.
- Philadelphia, Blumer, 1831.
- Philadelphia, G. W. Mentz & Son, 1833, 24mo, pp. 108.
- Philadelphia, Mentz & Rovoudt, 1841, 16mo, pp. 120.
- Chambersburg, Druckerei der Deutsch Ref. Kirche, 1841, 32mo, pp. 110.
- Philadelphia, Mentz & Rovoudt, 1843, 24mo, pp. 128.
- Baltimore, Md., Elias Heiner, 1849, 32mo, pp. 69.

## 2. English Editions.

The Heidelberg Catechism or Method of Instruction in the Christian Religion.

- Hanover, Starck & Lange, 1810.
- Philadelphia, Mary Sweitzer, 1812, 24mo, pp. 72.
- Philadelphia, G. W. Mentz, 1820.
- Hagerstown, Gruber & May, 1830.
- Philadelphia, A. Leimer, 1830, 24mo, pp. 72.
- Philadelphia, G. W. Mentz & Son, 1831, 24mo, pp. 71.
- Philadelphia, G. W. Mentz & Son, 1833, 24mo, pp. 71.
- Philadelphia, G. W. Mentz & Son, 1837, 24mo, pp. 90.
- New York, Scofield & Voorhies, 1839, 16mo, pp. 90. Compiled by Andrew Snyder, M.D.
- Chambersburg, Office of Publ., 1840.
- Philadelphia, G. W. Mentz & Son, 1841, 24mo, pp. 71.
- Chambersburg, Office of Publ., 5th ed., 1842, 32mo, pp. 96.
- Chambersburg, Office of Publ., 7th ed., 1846, 24mo, pp. 55.
- Baltimore, Sherwood & Co., 1846.
- Philadelphia, Mentz & Rovoudt, 1846, 24mo, pp. 90.
- Chambersburg, Office of Publ., 1847, 8th ed., 32mo, pp. 55.

## 3. Editions of the Palatinate Catechism.

Catechismus oder Kurtzer Unterricht Christlicher Lehre. Mit Zeugnissen der heiligen Schrift erklärt u. bestätigt.

- Philadelphia, Peter Miller & Co., 1762, 12mo, pp. 286.
- Philadelphia, Steiner & Cist, 1777, 12mo, pp. 286.
- Germantown, M. Billmeyer, 1795.
- Philadelphia, Steiner & Kämmerer, 1795, 12mo, pp. 286.
- Easton, Chr. Jac. Hütter, 1812, 16mo, pp. 288.
- Easton, —, 1829, 12mo, pp. 287.

The Heidelberg Catechism with Proof Texts and Explanations as used in the Palatinate. Translated by Rev. J. H. Good and Rev. H. Harbaugh.

- Chambersburg, M. Kieffer & Co., 1849, 16mo, pp. 311.
- Chambersburg, M. Kieffer & Co., 1854, 16mo.
- Philadelphia, Publ. Board, n. d., 16mo, pp. 252.

## II. PRIVATE CATECHISMS.

1. *Independent of the Heidelberg Catechism.*

1. Catechism of Count Zinzendorf (edited by John Bechtel).

Kurzer Catechismus vor etliche Gemeinen Jesu aus der Reformirten Religion in Pennsylvania. Die sich zum alten Berner Synode halten: Herausgegeben von Johannes Bechteln, Diener des Worts Gottes. Philadelphia, Gedruckt bey Benjamin Franklin, 1742, 12mo, pp. 42.

A Short Catechism for Some Congregations of Jesus Of the Reformed Religion In Pennsylvania, Who Keep to the Ancient Synod of Bern, Agreeable to the Doctrine of the Moravian Church. First published in German by John Bechtel, Minister of the Word of God. Philadelphia. Printed by Isaiah Warner, almost opposite to Charles Brockden's in Chestnut-Street, MDCCXLII., 12mo, pp. 36.

2. Catechism of Dr. Fr. A. Lampe (edited by Dr. C. M. Stapel).

D. Fried. Adolph Lampens . . . Wahrheits Milch . . . in etwas vermehrt und mit der Vorrede des Predigers bey der Reformirt-Hochdeutschen Gemeine zu Anweil in New-Jersey, Dr. Caspar Michael Stapels, Unter Vorwissen des Ehrwürd. Pensylvanischen Coetus. Zum Druck befördert, und verlegt von Wilhelm Käss. Philadelphia, Gedruckt bey Anton Arnbrüster, in Moravian Alley, 1762, 24mo, pp. 40.

3. First Lebanon Catechism.

Kurzer Inbegriff der Christlichen Lehre nebst einer kurzgefassten Kirchengeschichte des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Lancaster, gedruckt bey Johann Albrecht, 1804, 12mo, pp. 56. [The preface is dated Lebanon, January, 1804.]

[Same] Haupt-Inhalt der Christlichen Lehre Nebst einer kurzgefassten Kirchen Geschichte. Lebanon, gedruckt bey Jacob Schnee, 1808.

- Philadelphia, Jacob Schnee, 1810, 3d ed., 16mo, pp. 47.
- Lebanon, Jacob Schnee, 1813.
- Reading, Heinrich B. Sage, 1816, 4th ed., 12mo, pp. 45.
- Reading, Heinrich B. Sage, 1821, 5th ed., 12mo, pp. 40.
- Reading, Johann Ritter u. Comp., 1832, 6th ed., 12mo, pp. 51.

4. Catechism of Christian Ludwig Becker.

Kurzer Entwurf der Christlichen Lehre von Dr. Christian Ludwig Becker, Lancaster, Gedruckt bey Johann Albrecht, 1805, 16mo, pp. 16.

- Hanover, Starck & Lange, 1808.
- Lancaster, Hamilton & Ehrenfried, 1810, 12mo, pp. 16.
- Harrisburg, Gleim & Wiestling, 1811.
- Friedrichstadt, C. T. Melsheimer, 1813.

5. Catechism of Frederick Lebrecht Hermann.

Catechismus der Glaubenslehren u. Lebenspflichten der Christlichen Religion. Zum Unterricht der Jugend und Confirmanden eingerichtet und empfohlen, von L. F. Hermann, Prediger der reformirten Gemeinde in Neu-Hanover. Reading, gedruckt bey Johann Ritter und Comp., 1813, 16mo, pp. 70.

- Reading, J. Ritter und Comp., 1819, 16mo, pp. 70.
- Reading, J. Ritter & Co., 1826.
- Philadelphia, Lippincott & Co., 1854.
- Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., n. d., 16mo, pp. 96.

**6. Catechism of Jacob Christian Becker.**

Kurzer Entwurf der Christlichen Lehre, in Fragen und Antworten.

Zum Unterricht der Jugend. Von J. Chr. Becker, V.D.M. Allentown, Gedruckt bei Gräter und Blumer, 1833, 12mo, pp. 49.

— Allentown, A. W. Blumer, 1838.

— [No place], F. R. Weber, 1850, 24mo, pp. 63.

**7. Catechetical Book of Horatius Daniel.**

Kurzer Entwurf der Christlichen Glaubens-Lehre und unserer Lebens-Pflichten für die heranwachsende Generation. Von Horatius Daniel, Deutschem und englischem evangelisch-reformirtem Prediger zu Mifflin und Umgegend. Mifflin, 1847. Zu haben in der Wohnung des Verfassers. Pottsville, gedruckt bei C. W. Günther, 16mo, pp. 158.

**2. Based on the Heidelberg Catechism.****1. Catechism of Samuel Helfenstein.**

Kurze Unterweisung in der Christlichen Religion, nach dem Heidelbergischen Catechismus, von Samuel Helfenstein, Prediger der Hochdeutschen Reformirten Gemeine in Philadelphia, gedruckt bey Conrad Zentler, in der Zweyten nahe bey der Rehs Straße, 1810, 12mo, pp. 60.

— Carlisle, John McFarland, 1818, 16mo, pp. 97. [German and English.]

A Short Instruction in the Christian Religion according to the Heidelberg Catechism, Philadelphia, John G. Ritter, 1826, 24mo, pp. 64.

**2. Second Lebanon Catechism.**

Zusammenhang der Christlichen Lehre nach Anleitung des Heidelbergischen Catechismi. Libanon, Jacob Schnee, 1810, 16mo, pp. 42.

— Lebanon, J. Hartman, 1818, 2d ed., 16mo, pp. 50.

**3. Catechism of Jonathan Rahausser.**

Ein Kurzer Auszug aus dem Heidelberg Catechismus, in Frag und Antwort. A Short Extract from the Heidelberg Catechism, in Question and Answer. By Jonathan Rahausser, Minister of the Gospel at Hagerstown. Hagerstown, Printed by Gruber and May, 1817, 24mo, pp. 107.

— Lancaster, J. Bear, 1821, 24mo, pp. 107.

— Hagerstown, Gruber & May, 1829, 24mo, pp. 54.

— Selinsgrove, Penna., Amos Stroh, 1831, 16mo, pp. 51.

**4. Allentown Catechism.**

Christlicher Unterricht der Religion. In Fragen und Antworten. Allentown, Gedruckt bey Heinrich Ebner, 1820, pp. 57.

[Same] Unterricht in der Christlichen Religion. In Fragen und Antworten. Allentown, Pa., Gedruckt und zu haben bei Blumer & Busch, 1844, 24mo, pp. 63.

— Allentown, Blumer, Busch & Co., 1853, pp. 63.

## 5. Catechism of John Henry Helffrich.

Christlicher Unterricht der Religion. In Fragen und Antworten. Allentown, Gedruckt bey Heinrich Ebner und Comp., 1826, 12mo, pp. 52.

— Allentown, A. & W. Blumer, 1839, 3d ed., 24mo, pp. 61.

— Weisenburg, [John Helffrich], 1852, 5th ed., 24mo, pp. 71.

## 6. Catechism of John Brown.

Eine Kurze Unterweisung Christlichen [!] Religion, nach dem Heidelbergischen Catechismus, in den Deutschen und Englischen Sprachen, bey Johannes Braun, Diener des Evangelii. A Short Instruction according to the Heidelberg Catechism, in German and English by John Brown, Minister of the Gospel. Harrisonburg: Printed: by Lawrence Wartmann, Rockingham County, Virginia, 1830, 16mo, pp. 72.

## 7. Catechism of Samuel Hess.

Kurzgefasster Unterricht der Christlichen Religion, in Fragen und Antworten zum Gebrauch der Jugend. Von Samuel Hess, V.D.M. Easton: Gedruckt von Heinrich Held, 1843, 12mo, pp. 47.

## 8. Catechisms of Samuel R. Fisher.

Exercises on the Heidelberg Catechism for Families, Sabbath Schools and Catechetical Classes. By Samuel R. Fisher. Chambersburg, Pa., Office of Publication, 1844, 16mo, pp. 352.

— Chambersburg, M. Kieffer & Co., 1854, pp. 256.

— Philadelphia, Ref. Ch. Publ. House, n. d., 16mo, pp. 256.

The Heidelberg Catechism Simplified; or, Introduction to the "Exercises of the Heidelberg Catechism." By Samuel R. Fisher, Chambersburg, Pa., Printed by M. Kieffer & Co., 1850.

— Chambersburg, M. Kieffer & Co., 1850, 2d ed., 32mo, pp. 92.

— Chambersburg, M. Kieffer & Co., 1859, 10th ed., 32 mo, pp. 96.

— Chambersburg, M. Kieffer & Co., 1863, 11th ed., 24mo, pp. 96.

NOTE.—In conclusion, two catechisms may be mentioned, of which thus far nothing but the title is known. Seidensticker notes in his *First Century of German Printing*, p. 32, as a book printed by C. Saur in 1748: *Der Sigenische Catechismus oder ein Auszug aus dem Heidelberger Catechismus*. Another catechism is entered by Seidensticker (*i. c.*, p. 155) as printed in 1800: "*Der Kleine Reformirte Catechismus*, Philadelphia, Heinrich Schweizer, 1800, 16mo, pp. 144."

## IV.

### THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM FOR CATECHIZATION.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. HENRY H. RANCK.

The Heidelberg Catechism has two functions as used in our Reformed Church in the United States. It is the standard of doctrine and also the book used in the instruction of our children for church membership and the Christian life. This second function claims our attention.

The Reformed Church is the only one of the great historic Reformation churches that uses its confession of faith for this second purpose. The Augsburg confession in the Lutheran Church, the Thirty-nine Articles in the Anglican and Episcopal Church, the Westminster confession in the Presbyterian Church, are the Symbols in these denominations; but each has its shorter catechism for the instruction of the young. That the Heidelberg Catechism should serve for three hundred and forty-five years in this double capacity shows that it has intrinsically very great merit.

Our Catechism is the flower of the Reformation age. It was published nearly fifty years after Zwingli began to preach the great Reform at Einsiedeln, and gathered up all that was best, in the many Protestant tendencies, and from the numerous catechisms already published. As has been well said, "It has Lutheran inwardness, Melanchthonian clearness, Zwinglian simplicity, and Calvinistic fire, all fused together." Its ready adoption in many cities and states beyond the Palatinate, the enthusiastic devotion which it commanded and the high appreciation in which it has been held so long, prove

<sup>1</sup> Paper read at the Spiritual Conference, Asbury Park, N. J., August 4, 1908.

that it is a work of genius which will always stand as a literary landmark in Christian history. Written and published while the Reformation ideas were still nascent, before Protestant scholasticism held sway, it is marked by a freshness and vitality, a personal and devotional character, which will always make it a prized "book of the heart," a fountain of piety and a source of religious inspiration.

It is remarkable, not only that this compend of Christian truth was so prized and well suited to its own age, but that it is still satisfactory to many catechists to-day. There is no minister of the Reformed Church but has the highest appreciation of the Catechism as a work of its own age; but the great majority of pastors are feeling more and more that it is no longer suited to our time nor to the work which a manual of instruction is expected to do for us.

The Church is under fire to-day. She is being criticized because of her deficiencies on every hand. Our ideals of what she might do are such that we all feel she is not doing what she should. Our own denomination emphasizes educational religion, and the thorough training of the youth is certainly the point of vantage in the upbuilding of an efficient church. Are our failures due to our Catechism's shortcomings? Important as it is to have a highly suited manual of instruction, far more will depend on teacher and preacher than on the instrument he uses in the way of a text-book. Christ cannot be hid either in a cold creed or even in an obsolete Catechism, especially when he is incarnated in an earnest, loving pastor. Nevertheless, the very placing of this subject on the program here, indicates one of two things; either there is great room for improvement in our use of the Catechism and we need to learn to use it more efficiently, or the Catechism is unfitted for the work of catechization and we need a new manual of instruction. The latter is my candid judgment, the reasons for which I will give later in this paper; but that you may have brought before you not only one man's judgment as to what should be done in this

matter, I have communicated with a large number of our ministers and have gotten replies on several questions touching this subject from sixty. They come from every important section, heritage, tendency, temperament and school of thought and I think are fairly representative of the judgment of the entire Reformed Church. The questions are as follows:

1. How many months each year do you give to catechization?
2. At what age do you have the youth begin attending the class?
3. Do you have the catechumens commit the questions and answers? If so, how many and on which do you lay emphasis?
4. Do you have supplemental work? If so, what is the nature of it?
5. Is our Heidelberg Catechism satisfactory to you for the practical work of instructing the youth?
6. Do you think it would be wise and timely for our Reformed Church to provide a catechumen's handbook for the instruction of our youth for church membership, the same to embody in smaller compass the essential teaching of our Catechism and to give instruction in the special moral, social and church needs of to-day? The handbook, of course, would not supplant the Catechism as the standard of faith.

Let me briefly sum up the answers, many of which are to represent the city or community or constituency of which the respondent is a part.

More than one half of the sixty give from five to six months every year to catechization; one sixth from three to four months, i. e., between January first and Easter. This is the practise of many western brethren. One reports that his environment has always been unfavorable to using the Catechism and hence he has employed it but little; over one sixth have catechization from seven to twelve months and all but a few of this group are brethren of the German Synods. Some German ministers have their classes from two to three hours a week.

About one half of the ministers have the children begin to attend the class at twelve years of age; a few at thirteen and fourteen and one at fifteen. One fourth have them begin at ten and eleven. To me it is surprising that the remaining one fourth have the boys and girls under ten come to the class, and one minister says that he desires to confirm at ten and would receive some into the church younger, if the parents permitted it. Quite a number of pastors have junior classes in which a simplified form of the Catechism is sometimes used.

Over one half have the catechumens commit from ten to twenty-eight of the leading questions and answers; a few insist on but five or six of the choicest; four have no committing whatever. The seven German brethren responding strive to have all committed and seem to succeed very well. Not a single minister responding from an English Synod, succeeds in having all committed, though a few appear to desire it and several succeed in having from forty to sixty memorized. The less emphasis the minister puts upon rote work, the more he uses the Catechism as a basis and guide to treat its topics and themes in his own way.

Touching supplemental work, ten do nothing whatever in connection with the catechetical class, the Sunday-school no doubt, must supply this; but five sixths of these brethren pay a good deal of attention to this phase, this work being for the most part, history of the Catechism and of the Church, a study of Bible Books and Bible history, the committing of choice scripture passages and hymns, the explanation of the church constitution, the church year and the duties of the church member, etc. Quite a number have outlined elaborate supplemental courses to meet the needs which they regard important.

To the question, "Is the Heidelberg Catechism satisfactory to you for this practical work of instructing the youth?" thirty-eight of the sixty, answer, "No," a few of whom have this qualification, "except as a working basis"; seventeen answer, "Yes," with a few admissions that the catechist must

do much to adapt it. The remaining five are evasive or give double answers—that the Catechism is satisfactory in one feature but not in another.

That we should have a better help in the way of a handbook for the instruction of our youth comes out very decisively in the answers to my last question. Of the sixty responding, forty-nine are affirmative, nearly all emphatically so, and only a few of them with qualifications like this: that such manual must be of the right kind or there must be a prevailing demand for the same for them to approve; nine are opposed to such a move including all seven of the German brethren, most of them very emphatically opposed, though one German brother grants that some ministers may need it and he would not object to the optional use of such manual. Another of the "nine" answers "No" because such a book would doubtless negative the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism. He would favor an abridged Heidelberg Catechism. The remaining two of the sixty, among the strongest leaders of the church, are non-committal, though the one does say in the fifth answer, that the Catechism is "not wholly satisfactory for catechization"; the other affirms that our Catechism is "the best of its kind" for this work, but he would have no objection to the publishing of such a book, if unofficially done, the same to be used optionally.

Even this cold summary of results shows what an interesting bunch of letters are these sixty answers to my questions. Many of these answers give opportunity to the writers to express their views on theology, cultus and church practise. There is a wonderful variety of opinions on these vital questions of the church, which leads me to this undoubted conclusion, which, let me express, by the way, that our Reformed Church in the United States is the roomiest Church in Christendom. There are high churchmen and low churchmen, orthodox and heterodox, ritualists and revivalists, men of the letter and men of the spirit, antiquarians and iconoclasts, individualists and socialists, conservatives and progressives, re-

actionaries and radicals, almost every conceivable phase of valid religious form, yet all thoroughly Christian, vying with one another in loyalty to Christ and the Reformed Church, in devotion to the Holy Catholic Church and the work of establishing the Kingdom of God on Earth.

This roominess and freedom in the use of the Catechism is to me one of the chief glories of our Reformed Church. In spite of the great diversity of methods in dealing with the Catechism, we must see, from the early age generally prevalent of beginning catechization and the number of months annually devoted to it, from the large amount of supplemental work employed,—and a perusal of these letters makes it much more emphatic,—how earnest our brethren are in efforts to indoctrinate the youth. This symposium also shows most decidedly that to the great majority of our ministers and to the younger of them almost to a man, outside of the German Synods, the Heidelberg Catechism is very poorly suited to its work of youth training and that the time is at hand for providing something better. It is interesting to note that this very suggestion to retain the Catechism as our standard and to provide a manual of instruction, was made by Dr. Karl Ullmann one of the distinguished contributors to the Tercentenary Monument to the Heidelberg Catechism.

The Catechism is too long for our use,—about twice as lengthy as the shorter Catechism of the Presbyterians, nearly three times as long as Luther's short Catechism, and eight times as long as the Anglican Catechism. Three hundred years ago, there was no Sunday-school and the Catechetical class took its place, continuing through the year. The average time now as we have seen is five or six months, and this means curtailed treatment. Parts of the Catechism are too elaborate, the discussion of the sacraments, for example. This full treatment was necessary three hundred and fifty years ago because of the controversies over both. The doctrines of the Holy Supper called for defense against Lutherans and Roman Catholics on the one hand and those of Holy Baptism against

the Anabaptists on the other. All but a very few catechists omit or bestow slight attention on many of the questions because they cannot give the time to the full mastery of the Catechism as it stands, even if they wished to.

Many of us must dissent from some of the theology of the Catechism and we are not in accord with the proportion and emphasis given to some truths. We all believe there are sinful tendencies in human nature and a fall and misery because of sin; we all believe Jesus Christ is the divine Savior to bring man to God and to usher in the Kingdom; we all believe in the atonement; we all believe every fact and doctrine referred to in the Catechism but we can't all accept the identical explanation which the Catechism gives. There has been diligent searching of the scriptures in these latter days. We have more accurate knowledge of man, history and the universe and of God's relation to all these, hence we have to-day, a better understanding of the facts and truths of redemption than ever before and as men of God we must not be disobedient to these visions of truth. We must be true to our Lord as we understand him. Every minister of our denomination will affirm that every Christian teacher must present the truth as he knows it. The day is past in the history of the Protestant Church when we call on any man to surrender his faith and conviction of truth to the decision of others, even though their beliefs be authenticated by great councils and stand in veneration for three and one half or for sixteen centuries. The simple fact is that a very large number of our ministers do not and cannot teach some of the truths with which the Catechism deals in its language and accent and many of us chafe and fret under this condition not a little. Hence we omit whole groups of questions, evade and pass lightly over sentences and clauses. We tell our catechumens that the progress of human thought in three centuries requires a different explanation of truth; but with it all I do feel that an unsalutary impression is left on the minds of our youth. We fail to give that conviction of certainty in our undoubted

faith when the book says one thing and we say another. As one of my correspondents put it,— there is too much lumber in the Catechism and it is not a little exasperating to be obliged to revise and explain it at the same time. The Catechism was admirably suited to the knowledge, world view and temper of the sixteenth century and for a long time thereafter. If it was suited to the sixteenth century, for that very reason it is unfitted for the twentieth. It is the inalienable right of every man to approach his Lord from his own point of view. True, we must come to understand Christ in the setting of his own Jewish environment, isolate him in his essentials from things provincial and then put him before us as the Lord of our own life and our own age. And it is not an easy thing to make the Christ of Palestine the Christ of Pennsylvania, but children at least ought not be hindered in their approach to Him by being obliged to pass through the theology and polemics of the sixteenth century or of the fourth.

You will not suppose that I am undervaluing the Christianity and theology of the Nicene or of our Reformed fathers. They all throw immense light on our religious heritage and show us how it works itself into these several ages and is modified and adjusted to their presuppositions and points of view. Each age must work out its own theology and solve its own problems. We must do our own thinking; no other age can do it for us.

As catechist no less than preacher, the minister must speak with the note of authority of the things which he has heard and seen and handled of the word of life. Sincerity and perfect candor must be his, if he is to impress the men of to-day with the reality of the things of God. This hard task is made the more difficult when he is obliged to use the phrasing and forms of an age altogether different from his own. The ministry has none too much credit for candid frankness. Few, however, realize the difficulty of the situation—to be true on the one hand to the old and at the same time be true to himself. It is of the utmost importance to have new forms

for the new thought. Harnack reminds us how a persistent use of old forms, even when the new truth has been inculcated, tends to eject the new and reëstablish the old. Those of our members more advanced in years hold the saving truth in the old forms, they would change their views at much discomfort and peril. We should not needlessly disturb them. But we do a wrong to the young mind when we have him learn truth in conceptions that are becoming obsolete and then imperil his faith by the transition which as a thoughtful man, he is sure to make. Old sermons will not answer present needs; we all know how quickly we outgrow them—even as the sermons of Ursinus and Olevianus, powerful and pertinent when preached would lack point to-day. How can we expect their Catechism, with all its exceptional merits, to be satisfactory now?

Even weightier reasons than these are filed against our Catechism for the work of catechization. Progress has been made in pedagogy as well as in theology and several of the participants in my symposium find their chief objection here. The Catechism is too difficult for the minds of children and youth. We may well question the wisdom of pushing very far the practise of learning by rote what they can understand only after they become more mature. There is, moreover, really no excuse for this when the essentials of the Christian life, the profoundest principles may be grasped by the child. Emphasis on dogma gives a wrong idea of what religion really is and is apt to put men in peril of missing the reality. There are things hid from the wise and prudent that are revealed unto babes. I heartily agree with a noted educator who asserts that "the Christian Church should make clear to the whole world that it has abandoned the dogmatic method of hanging imperative practical issues of life upon purely theoretical considerations."

The catechetical method has its merits. The practise of Christ and Socrates in arousing attention and drawing forth truth thereby, vouch for it. The questions used, however,

must be such as arise naturally in the child's mind or at least, mean something to him. The questions of other men in other days may mean very little to us. They presume difficulties which very likely do not puzzle us, or at least not our children, and the raising of such questions perplexes rather than enlightens.

Child study is a fruitful inquiry among the pedagogues of to-day. Religious education is receiving more and more attention, and here comes in the broader question of the systematic and effective religious training of our children in the home and Sunday-school as well as in the Catechetical class. In the campaign of bringing the world to Christ, the church's weakest point is in its relation to the young; here is our nearest opportunity, our one first-class chance, here difficulties are smallest; yet if we are awaking to this fact we have not yet grappled with it seriously,—nay, we have not yet even thought it through. The Sunday-school relieves most parents of the prime responsibility in the religious training of their children and then does the work in haphazard, sporadic fashion. Professor G. A. Coe has these strong words, "The methods of the ordinary Sunday-school are far behind those of the common school—as far behind as the tallow dip is behind the electric light" (322). We do not have consistent coördination of these agencies and in saying this we entertain only the highest appreciation of the devotion of earnest laymen to Sunday-school work and of the great worth of their services. The Lutheran Church in most branches has a definite system which is very effectively carried out and it produces a membership only less loyal than that of the Roman Church. The Roman Catholics have a consistent system of youth training which makes that church the most powerful organization in the world to-day. Yet their wisest men utter words like these, "There is a large consensus of opinion on two important facts—the difficulty, irksomeness and generally unsatisfactory character of our catechetical systems, and the enormous losses from the ranks of those who have gone through that training.

No merely extrinsic causes would, I think, be able to neutralize so largely the efforts of Christian education unless there were some vital deficiencies in the system, itself." The Romanists have the immense advantages of compelling system but many of their principles are untrue to human nature and this disadvantage they will feel more and more.

Horace Bushnell is the path breaker in modern Protestantism in bringing the Church to the right conception of Christian nurture.—"What is the true idea of Christian education? That the child is to grow up a Christian and never know himself to be otherwise." This question and answer is the theme of his epoch-making book of a half century ago. Whatever else Baptism signifies, it does mean, as Christ said, that the child does belong to the Kingdom. Assuming this fact in theory and in practise, it is ours to train up this child of God into fine efficiency in the Kingdom of God. Professor Coe states the case for the modern church truly when he says, "The real problem of religious nurture is not that of instilling adult beliefs into the child mind, but that of promoting child religion in the child mind. For this reason, catechetics must not merely simplify the doctrines of the church before putting them before the child; it must abandon the whole intellectualistic scheme upon which the Catechisms have been built."

The Reformed Church stands for a type of religion which recognizes the strategic position of the child. We build foundations. Our plan is sane and we ought not let it prove ineffectual for want of a suitable manual. To go on revising and adjusting, explaining and explaining away the Heidelberg Catechism as it stands, is a practise not only intolerable, but fails to bring the results we have a right to expect. Moreover, in the measure that educational religion is inefficient, revivalism is bound to prevail and will be needed—and with it very likely an evangelism which is irrational, spectacular and very obnoxious to many.

What now shall we have as a text book to get the best re-

sults in the pastor's class. We can prepare more editions of the Heidelberg Catechism with a view of adapting it; but they will never be satisfactory. The unceasing flow of these editions, of which Dr. Hinke has told us, is itself proof of the futility of the attempt.

Shall General Synod authorize the revision of the Heidelberg Catechism, eliminating the parts that are obsolete and unsuitable and inserting parts that are now needed? What we would get would be a crazy patchwork, without unity and little more satisfactory than what we have. If we, "cut and carve" we will destroy the Catechism's life. We have no right to do this. Let the Catechism stand as a splendid monument of the faith and piety of our Reformed fathers. It would be little short of vandalism to mutilate it.

Looking at this venerable symbol in its historic setting, we, as loyal ministers and elders of the Reformed Church can subscribe to it as the standard of our faith. The only thing we can now do which will answer present needs is to get a new book of a length which can be covered comfortably in five or six months, embodying the facts, truths and duties a young Christian should know in simple, vital, non-theological fashion.

How and by whom shall this work be done? It is natural for us to think that General Synod should appoint a committee to prepare the manual and then to report to the General Synod for its adoption. This might be done but the use of the book thus approved should not be made compulsory. To strive to accomplish this would produce a strife which we would all deplore. Any attempt to produce a book which all sections and tendencies of the Church could accept by compromise would satisfy none and leave us in a condition little better than at present. Such a compromise work is almost sure to be the result of any official attempt. Moreover, to make such a book officially the catechumen's text-book would require a change in the Constitution; this of course, might be made.

We need to remember too, that there is a large and loyal section of the Church who want and will have none other than the Heidelberg Catechism for catechization. Their beliefs are identically those of the Catechism. We are bound to respect their conscientious views and rejoice in their privilege of using the book they desire. They would do violence to their faith and could not do effective work if they went counter to their views. No minister can do his work properly except in the atmosphere of freedom. And if one part of the church enjoys freedom in the matter under discussion, and we gladly grant it to them, I am sure they will with equal readiness grant us the same freedom. It seems to me, moreover, that a handbook such as proposed could be produced and used without the approval of the General Synod and yet not violate the spirit or letter of the Constitution. We are governed in this matter by Art. 204 of the New Constitution which says: "Every pastor shall carefully prepare the youth in his charge for communicant membership in the Church by diligently instructing them in the doctrines and duties of the Christian religion. The Heidelberg Catechism shall be used in such instruction." It does not say that the Heidelberg Catechism *alone* shall be used. Abundant room is left for the use of other helps and for the liberty of interpretation such as the majority of the ministers now exercise.

The procedure which seems to me wisest and most feasible would be something like this.

Let some man or group of men prepare and publish the book in the way they think best on their own financial responsibility. Let them bind up with it the Heidelberg Catechism and have a chapter explaining the historical relation of the Heidelberg Catechism to the manual thus offered. As there would be many references to the Scriptures in the manual so let there be references to the Heidelberg Catechism, the choice parts of which in greater or less measure, particularly by older pupils, might be especially studied as is now done. A plan like this, I believe, could be carried out without con-

troversy. The new book would have to work its own way into acceptance with the church. Indeed there might well be a number of such books prepared by different men and presented for our consideration and use, and then let the fittest survive. Later books could profit by the merits and demerits of former ones until perhaps in a generation or two, the Church would rise to a plane of unanimity in theology, pedagogy and church practise so that some geniuses like Ursinus and Olevianus would arise who, like the great authors of our venerated symbol, would build on the other works and produce for the church a book which might serve for another tercentennium—even as Shakespeare appropriated earlier dramas in his works of genius and as the New Testament itself is based on and fulfils the Old Testament.

The unity of our Church would not be jeopardized by such liberal procedure. There is a deeper unity than that of a form of words; it is the unity of spirit based on heritage, association and common effort in the work of God. A demonization is a religious family, and love for the spiritual mother maintains the loyalty of ministers and members to their church.

If my words on this subject have been in a measure negative and critical, you will not have failed to catch the constructive purpose of it and you will know that the book which I desire, explaining less *how* Jesus Christ our Savior works and the metaphysical make of his being, would the more exalt Him as Lord and show His incomparable moral and spiritual pre-eminence, with a clearness and power which would equip the ministry as never before in laboring together with Christ to draw all men unto Him and to inspire them to seek first and always His Kingdom and His righteousness. May God raise up men equipped by nature, sympathy and education, to render this great service to our beloved Church.

READING, PA.

V.

CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY.

BY PROF. A. V. HIESTER.

(b) Etienne Cabet (1788-1856) was a French advocate and politician of good education who had taken a leading part in the revolution of 1830, and who, soon after the accession of Louis Philippe, was banished from France for a period of five years on the charge of *lèse-majesté*. He went first to Belgium and later to England where he came under Owenite influences and devoted himself to historical and philosophical studies. An examination of all the important philosophical works in the London libraries satisfied him that the great philosophers of ancient and modern times had all advocated communism, or at least admitted it to be the most perfect social system. The effect of Cabet's studies and personal contact with Owenism was to make him a thoroughgoing communist, and in 1840, soon after his return to France, he published his views in a romance entitled "Voyage en Icarie." Like More's "Utopia," whose influence it clearly reflects, it was chiefly a description of an imaginary state which had been transformed, in the course of a half century, into a communistic commonwealth through such measures as a progressive income tax, abolition of the right of inheritance, state regulation of wages, national workshops, agricultural colonies, and a complete system of public education. Like More, too, Cabet wrote in all probability without any thought that his ideas would ever be realized.

The book made a sensation. Not only did the discontented masses, who had been carried away by the philosophy of "Icarianism," demand the immediate realization of its bless-

ings, but Cabet was also challenged by his adversaries—for his views had encountered bitter opposition as well as frenzied assent—to demonstrate the practicability of his scheme. Warned, however, by Owen's failures, Cabet stoutly maintained that the masses could be prepared for a communal life only through a long course of education, and that the premature inauguration of communism through the establishment of small isolated communities would do little good, if successful, and much harm, if they failed, as they were almost sure to do. Nevertheless, goaded by the insistent demands of friend and foe, Cabet resolved finally to make an attempt at practical communism by establishing an agricultural colony in the wilds of North America.

Early in 1848 Cabet purchased from the agents of a Texas land company in London one million acres of land in that commonwealth, which had recently been admitted into the United States and was then putting forth every effort to attract settlers. This somewhat mythical transaction was promptly followed by the departure of the first company of colonists, a picked body of 69 persons pledged to the principles of communism. When they reached New Orleans they were at once confronted by three distinct disappointments. In the first place, they learned from a closer examination of the contract between Cabet and the Texas land company that the latter had agreed to sell, not a million of acres, but only a half section of 320 acres for each settler, and this much only on the condition that he would build a house on his claim prior to July 1, 1848. Secondly, the lands contracted for, instead of being situated on the navigable Red River, as the colonists had been led to believe, were not only at least 250 miles from that stream, but remote from any navigable body of water, and accessible only by a long and toilsome overland route. The third disappointment was that the allotted claims, instead of being located contiguously, consisted of the halves of alternate sections, the obvious effect of such a checker-board arrangement being to make any attempt to establish

a communistic colony on a large scale simply hopeless. That these men persisted in their purpose in the face of all these discouragements is a splendid tribute to their faith and courage.

When they finally reached Texas after suffering extraordinary hardships the colonists immediately turned their attention to the erection of log cabins, and succeeded in building thirty-two and establishing their claims to 10,240 acres in accordance with the terms of their contract. But before they could plant their first crops they were attacked by malarial fever. After a number had died they decided to return to New Orleans and await the arrival of Cabet with reinforcements. Cabet arrived during the following winter, but instead of the expected thousands of laborers and mechanics, who had declared their intention of following him to America when he first announced his purpose of founding a communistic settlement, only four hundred came. The chief reason for this was that the revolution of 1848, the establishment of the Second Republic in place of the government of Louis Philippe, and the inauguration of government workshops, all of which took place soon after the departure of the first colony, had filled the working classes of France with new hope and made them less eager to engage in communistic ventures in far-off America.

Cabet now found himself in a critical situation. With the discouragement that comes from absolute failure, with diminished resources, and less than five hundred followers, he had to make a second start. While awaiting the choice of a suitable location nearly half of this number withdrew. The remainder, two hundred and eighty in number, finally removed to Nauvoo, Ill., where they occupied the abandoned settlement of the Mormons, from whose agent they purchased a mill, distillery and several houses, and rented eight hundred acres of land. For a time the settlement prospered. In six or seven years the membership almost doubled itself. A number

of successful industries were established. Much attention was given to education, the children being instructed in a great variety of subjects, as well as in the principles of the Icarian philosophy. For the propaganda of communistic ideas books and tracts were printed in English, French and German. There were also a newspaper, a library of five thousand volumes, a theater and a brass band with fifty instruments.

But underneath this outward prosperity there were dissensions over questions of government. Two parties gradually arose, one favoring centralization in administration with Cabet as the central authority, the other demanding a greater degree of democracy. Matters came to a crisis in 1856 when the party of Cabet was defeated. The refusal of Cabet to abide by the result of the election was followed by his expulsion from the settlement. Nearly two hundred persons followed him from Nauvoo and after his death, which occurred a few weeks later, they settled temporarily in St. Louis.

They remained in St. Louis more than a year supporting themselves as individuals by the labor of their hands. Then they purchased for twenty-five thousand dollars Cheltenham, an estate of twenty-eight acres six miles west of the city. Here again, as at Nauvoo, they prospered until divided by questions of government. This time, however, the advocates of democracy lost the day and soon withdrew. This gave to the settlement its death blow, for the seceders were the young and able-bodied; and in 1864 it was formally dissolved.

To return to Nauvoo, after the withdrawal of Cabet and his adherents the settlement began to decline and after a few years, in the hope of securing conditions more favorable to the growth of communism, a tract of three thousand acres was purchased in southwestern Iowa. The place was named Icaria and the colony removed thither in 1860. From the first Nauvoo had been regarded as a temporary place of settlement. It was too small and too near to large masses of population. It was the purpose of these Icarians to establish

an independent and highly complex communistic society on a large scale, and for this they required a large tract of land removed as far as possible from diverting and hostile influences. The first years in Iowa were extremely discouraging. The colony was unable to pay the interest on the heavy mortgage which rested on its property; and its remoteness from large centers of population made it impossible to market its surplus products. Many became disheartened and left, so that by 1863 only thirty-five remained. But the construction of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad, which gave the colony access to large markets, and the high prices which prevailed during the Civil War, greatly improved the financial situation and inaugurated a period of comparative prosperity.

But the initial difficulties had no sooner been safely surmounted than internal dissensions began to crop up as before. This is only one more illustration of the danger which has always menaced communistic experiments of the secularist sort, for in the absence of religious considerations no other interest apparently is able to hold the members together for any length of time. The issue at Icaria was between a conservative and a radical party. The latter, influenced by modern ideas and composed chiefly of the younger element, demanded reforms in agricultural and industrial methods, the suffrage for women, and above all an aggressive propaganda of communistic ideas among outsiders. It was strongly influenced by the socialistic philosophy of Marx. Its spirit was aggressive and it wanted to get away from the old attitude of more or less complete isolation from the world; and when it failed in the effort to have the constitution amended in accordance with its views it demanded a division of the common property between the two factions. This, too, was refused by the conservative party. Then the radical party appealed to the courts and succeeded in having the charter forfeited in 1878. Each party now tried to reëstablish the community in accordance with its own views. The radical

party secured possession of the village but did not prosper; and in 1887 its property was divided among the remaining members. In the meantime, however, a number of this party had removed to California, where, after an unsuccessful career of three years, disheartened by the dissolution of the Iowa branch, they also divided the common property among the members and gave up communism.

The fortunes of the conservative party were scarcely more favorable. After securing its share of the property of the old community it established a new settlement a mile from the original village. Five years later it had thirty-four members. This settlement lasted longer than the settlements of the radical party but succumbed finally in 1895. It continued the principles of the mother society, and was distinguished above everything else for its extreme democracy. Its constitution laid down with much particularity the equality and brotherhood of all men and the supreme duty of holding all things in common. It also forbade servitude of all kinds and made liberal provision for education. A president was elected annually by the male membership, but his powers were strictly limited to carrying out the commands of the society. Without specific instructions from the society he could not so much as sell a bushel of wheat. Every Saturday night the members, both men and women, met for business. Women were permitted to speak but not vote at these meetings. The conclusions of each meeting bound the president and other officers of the society during the following week. There was no "unitary home," each family having its separate dwelling. Marriage was encouraged and even required.

(c) The communism associated with the name of Charles Fourier (1772-1837) is a modified communism. Something more than coöperation and yet not pure communism, it is best described by the statement that it stands midway between co-operation and communism. It differs from most other forms of communism in applying the communistic principle only to the production and consumption of wealth, not to its distribution.

It condemns the existing industrial order on the ground, not that its distribution of the social wealth is essentially unjust, but that its methods of production are wasteful and orderless. Its appeal is not to justice, but to order; not to the sentiments of men, but to their material interests. What it seeks to do is to carry on industry by means of associations of workers living together in a single building and economically self sufficient. These associations, known as *phalanxes*, were to be more or less isolated from one another and carry on their industrial activities under the direction of chiefs elected by their members. This principle of industrial democracy distinguished the social schemes of Fourier sharply from those of Robert Owen. Another distinction is that Fourier did not require the abolition of private property or even of private capital or inheritance. On the contrary, he specifically retained these from the existing social order. This may be seen in part from the manner in which he provided for the division of the profits of industry. In assigning four twelfths to capital as its share of the profits, five twelfths to labor and three twelfths to talent, he distinctly recognized the institution of private property and thus left the door wide open to all forms of inequality. The requirement that all the members of a *phalanx* must live together in a common building has misled some. That feature was adopted by Fourier, not to promote the common ownership and enjoyment of wealth, but simply to realize the chief principle of his scheme, viz., economy and order in production.

Fourier's social schemes had little success in his own country and none at all elsewhere in Europe. They had their greatest vogue in this country, having been introduced to the American people by Albert Brisbane. To a keen analytical mind, cultured by education and travel, Brisbane added broad sympathies and a genuine enthusiasm for humanity. While abroad he had studied under Comte and Hegel, and had come in contact with many men and women prominent in politics and letters. European society was then in a state of ferment,

and he became deeply interested in the humanitarian systems of the Utopian socialists of the day. For a time he was a disciple of St. Simon but soon abandoned that particular scheme of social regeneration as altogether impracticable. Then Fourier's recently published "Treatise on Domestic and Agricultural Association" fell into his hands. He was completely won by its strange philosophy, so that he went to Paris in 1832 for the purpose of studying under Fourier's direction the more intricate parts of his system. After his return to the United States Brisbane published in 1840 his "Social Destiny of Man," which is an exposition of Fourier's views and which laid the foundation of the Fourierite movement in this country.

Brisbane soon won for his views a notable following. Such eminent literary lights as Horace Greeley, who pledged his entire fortune, present and prospective, to the cause of Fourierism, Charles A. Dana, Parke Godwin, George Ripley, John S. Dwight, William Henry Channing, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry James, Theodore Parker, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, George William Curtis, John Russell Lowell, Margaret Fuller and Elizabeth Peabody, entered into the movement with tremendous enthusiasm. Their zeal knew no bounds. Pledging themselves that they "would not rest nor turn back" until the whole nation should be indoctrinated with the principles of associative unity, they inaugurated a brilliant and effective propaganda through public lectures, the newspapers, notably the *New York Tribune*, and such special organs as the *Phalanx* and *Harbinger*.

The political and economic conditions of the country were in the early forties peculiarly favorable to the movement. In the first place, the country was passing through a period of financial and industrial depression, and everywhere all classes, the ignorant and poor as well as the educated and rich, were in a receptive mood with respect to social and economic discussions. Then the movement was still further aided by the rapidly rising anti-slavery agitation, for the denunciation of

chattel slavery logically led to the criticism of all other forms of social dependence.

The effect of all these influences was that Fourierism swept over the northern states like a wave. During the four years, 1843-1846, not less than thirty associations were established, whose history is more or less definitely known, with probably as many more of which no published records are extant. Then there were doubtless still others which never got beyond the paper stage. Of the associations of which there is definite knowledge only four lived as long as four years. These were the North American Phalanx in Monmouth County, New Jersey; the Northampton Association at Northampton, Massachusetts; the Wisconsin Phalanx at Kenosha, Wisconsin; and Brook Farm, near Boston, Massachusetts, which was, however, a Fourierite association only in the latter half of its career.

The longest-lived and most successful of all the Fourierite associations was the North American Phalanx which lasted thirteen years. It was founded under unusually favorable conditions and was consequently the "test experiment on which Fourierism practically staked its all in this country." Among its evident advantages were capable and devoted leaders, an excellent class of people for colonists, a healthful location, a good soil, proximity to large markets, and a capital of eight thousand dollars. Ripley described the place as an "estate combining picturesque attractions with rare agricultural capabilities." With these initial advantages it escaped many of the hardships incident to the pioneer stage of social experiments. It was born with a silver spoon in its mouth and prospered from the beginning. At the end of the first year it owned a large dwelling accommodating one hundred persons, a machine shop operated by steam, a saw mill, a blacksmith shop and four hundred acres under cultivation. During this first year the membership of the colony had increased from twelve to seventy-seven and its capital from eight thousand to twenty-eight thousand dollars. The report for 1854 indicates continued prosperity. There were then 673 acres

under cultivation, seventy acres of apple and peach trees, various shops, and a dairy, laundry, saw mill and grist mill, all operated by steam. The chief industry was drying and bottling fruit. Potatoes, tomatoes, turnips, melons, cucumbers and garden seeds were raised, and wheat, rye and buckwheat flour, corn meal, samp and hominy manufactured in large quantities for the New York markets. The membership had increased to one hundred and the value of the land and improvements was estimated at sixty-seven thousand dollars.

Production was carried on in groups and the profits distributed in accordance with Fourier's scheme. Each one was charged with his board, lodging and whatever he received from the association, and credited with the value of his labor, the difference being paid in money. There was a fixed tariff of wages for the various occupations. For disagreeable or exhausting work the highest rate of wages was paid, and the lowest for the most attractive occupations. Thus a bricklayer received ten cents an hour, a farmer eight and a physician six. For unusual skill or talent special rewards were paid. The market rate of interest was paid on private capital. Each one chose his occupation and worked as much or as little as he pleased. The cost of living was low in proportion to wages. A good room in the main building rented for twelve dollars a year. All ate in a common dining hall, and towards its maintenance, chiefly for waiting, lighting and heating, each one was required to pay thirty-six cents a week. Meals were served *à la carte*, each one paying for what he ordered. Butter was half a cent, meat two cents, pie two cents, coffee half a cent a cup, and other things in proportion.

Despite the favorable showing in 1854 the community came to an abrupt end two years later. Of the two causes usually assigned for this, losses by fire and internal dissensions, the former was hardly a sufficient cause of dissolution; for Horace Greeley offered at once to loan the association twelve thousand dollars to build a new mill. That there were religious differences and personal difficulties among the members is well

known, but these were at most only a contributing cause. The real cause was that the early enthusiasm for this sort of social experimentation had largely disappeared after a trial of a few years. The novelty of the thing once worn off, the members began to sigh for the flesh pots of the world. To this must be added the fact that the social atmosphere of the country had become distinctly less favorable to such movements; for after the passing of the industrial depression serious interest in radical social reforms rapidly declined. But more than this, the North American Phalanx had the inherent weakness of all Fourierite experiments, and the only reason why it lasted longer than the others is that it was founded under more favorable conditions. It was, as Fourierism was everywhere, an illogical compromise between communism and the present industrial system; for it tried to change human feeling with respect to the principle of private property while still retaining it, and retained economic inequalities while condemning those of the outside world.

To these causes of failure inherent in Fourierism must be added certain others applicable to the great majority of experiments attempted in this country. These failed mainly because of a lack of capital, ordinary business capacity, and above all of patience and courage to endure the hard pioneering work required to place such an experiment on solid financial foundations. Fourier had clearly foreseen, like Cabet, the danger of hasty and ill-considered attempts to realize the benefits of associative labor. To forestall such attempts, which could only end in failure, he had firmly maintained that a *phalanx* could not properly unfold its benefits and beauties unless it had a membership of fifteen hundred or two thousand and a capital of not less than one million francs. But Fourierism took such a firm hold of the masses, and the people were so impatient to realize the blessings of the new social gospel, that his limitations were invariably disregarded. *Phalanxes* were established with a handful of indifferent material and with little or no capital. The experimenters were only too often,

as Greeley put it, "destitute alike of capacity, public confidence, energy and means." The lack of capital compelled them to buy either worthless lands, unfit for agriculture; or lands so far removed from large centers of population as to make manufacturing pursuits an impossibility, a serious disadvantage, particularly where the members were unaccustomed to agricultural labor.

With the failure of the Owenite, Icarian and Fourierite experiments of the first half of the nineteenth century, and the rise of modern socialism, communism ceased to be a propaganda and was no longer even a philosophy. "The proposal to organize society on a communistic principle," wrote Professor Sidgwick some years ago, "is one of which the serious interest has now passed away." But since the writing of these words there has been a curious revival of interest in communism. When Shaw wrote in 1884 he declared that he had come across at least fifty communities in the United States organized since 1870. Kent writing in 1901 described no less than twenty-five recent experiments. The same writer declared that the last decade of the nineteenth century "was perhaps more prolific of schemes and efforts to get out of the competitive struggle, with its pitiful extremes of wealth and poverty, into the coöperative life, with its promise of freedom from those ills, than any prior period of our history." Since then four or five additional communities have been established in various parts of the country, the best known being the Helicon Home Colony which was organized at Englewood, New Jersey, by Upton Sinclair, the author of "*The Jungle*."

Not all of these experiments, however, have been purely communistic. Some were coöperative rather than communistic, while others exhibited a strong infusion of anarchistic and socialistic elements.

This recent revival of communism has been largely owing to the rise of anarchism, one phase of that movement aiming at the overthrow of all government by force and the planting of a communal life on its ruins. Thus the Ruskin Common-

wealth, established in Tennessee in 1894, and the New Freedom Colony, organized a little later in Kansas, held as a cardinal principle that each individual should be free to work when he pleases and as he pleases. The Mutual Coöperative Association, founded in California in 1900, went still further, asserting that the greatest enemy of man is government authority in the name of law and order. Its distinguishing principle is the recognition of the absolute personal freedom of the individual in all respects, and the entire repudiation of all courts, legal proceedings and government officials.

The socialistic features of present-day communism are the fruit of the teachings of Marx. Thus the Coöperative Association of America, organized in Maine in 1900, provided in its constitution, in accordance with the well-known dictum of Marx that labor is the source of all value, that the whole product of industry, save only that part of it needed for further production, should be given to labor. Socialistic elements are also to be seen in the Topolobampo Society, which was established in Mexico in 1886, and which provided that land and other natural resources, as well as all forms of wealth created by the people in common, should be common property, and all public utilities be both owned and operated collectively.

Of these recent experiments the great majority, whether primarily coöperative, communistic, anarchistic or socialistic, failed after a brief career. Those still in existence are struggling with inadequate numbers and resources, as well as a lack of business capacity, common sense and frequently common honesty, and above all the staying qualities of the pioneer. Not one can be said to be, or to have been, successful, and none offers much promise for the future.

These various social experiments in communism, particularly those of the nineteenth century, which are nearer to our own time, and are able, therefore, to throw more light on contemporaneous social problems, can teach the sociologist much. It is true they present a great variety of principle and prac-

tice. This renders generalizing difficult, but the following conclusions may be safely affirmed:

1. *That a communistic organization of society, whether desirable or not on social and economic grounds, is not absolutely chimerical.* The proof of this is the fact that a number of societies based on communism have maintained an uninterrupted existence for fifty years or more, and that one—one society, although embracing many more or less distinct communes—has gone well over the century mark.

2. *That communism is not incompatible with a high degree of economic well-being.* It is precisely at this point that communism has received its hardest blows, and right here, too, it must make its strongest defense; for if it cannot justify itself as a scheme for the production and distribution of wealth all its other claims will be worthless. Political economists condemn communism on two chief grounds. The first is that it lacks "those stimulants to exertion which can alone overcome the natural indolence of man." Bastiat puts the point in this fashion: "We compete to-day to see who works most and best. Under another regime we should emulate one another to see who should work least and worst." It would not be hard of course to find instances in which communism has proved an economic failure. The brief experience of the Jamestown colony with communal ownership is a case in point. After the introduction of the principle of private property in 1611 as much was done in a day as formerly in a week. At Amana, too, it is frankly admitted that a member does not ordinarily do more than half as much work in a given time as a hired laborer. On the other hand, even with this easy way of doing things, the more successful communities, owing to their greater system, their superior thrift, their well-known practice of employing all sorts of labor-saving devices, their temperate habits, their comparative freedom from vice and sickness, and, in some cases, their superior intelligence, have all contributed, not only to secure more than the average degree of material comfort, but even to amass considerable wealth.

It is the general testimony of competent and unbiased observers that the members of the more successful communities "not only accumulated more property per capita than men averaged outside, but that during its accumulation they enjoyed a greater amount of comfort and vastly greater security against want and demoralization than were attained by their neighbors of the surrounding population, with better schools and training for their children, and far less exposure for the women and the aged and infirm."

It is evident of course that in order to secure the necessary zeal and interest on the part of each member a communistic society must not be large, for with every increase in the number of members the possibility of each one receiving the benefit of his own industry and economy becomes proportionately less. Thus in a society of one hundred thousand persons each one will benefit individually only to the extent of the one hundred-thousandth part of his own industry, zeal and ability, that is, practically not at all. It will be seen, therefore, that notwithstanding its theoretical principle—"from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs"—communism is unable in practice to eliminate all connection between service and reward. It is precisely on this ground that both Owen and Fourier with admirable foresight prescribed certain limitations; the former holding that to secure the best results a community should include between five hundred and two thousand persons, while the latter placed the minimum and maximum limits at fifteen hundred and two thousand. John Stuart Mill, too, must have had comparatively small communities in mind when he argued that individual self-interest in the efficiency of labor would be more complete in a communistic society than is at present the case as regards the great mass of labor.

The second argument usually urged against communism by political economists is that the abrogation of the laws of private property and the moral obligation imposed on every man by the commands of God and nature to support his own children,

would serve to remove all checks to the increase of population. This argument was rejected, however, by John Stuart Mill who stoutly maintained that excessive increase of population would be more likely to be repressed by public opinion in a communistic society, for "any augmentation of numbers which diminished the comfort or increased the toil of the mass would then cause (which now it does not) immediate and unmistakable inconvenience to every individual in the association; inconvenience which could not then be imputed to the avarice of employers, or the unjust privileges of the rich. In such altered circumstances opinion could not fail to reprobate, and if reprobation did not suffice, to repress by penalties of some description this or any other culpable self-indulgence at the expense of the community." This argument, again, implies comparatively small communities.

On this question, unfortunately, practical communism has not spoken with any degree of assurance, for the secularist experiments have proved too ephemeral, while some of the religious ones have practised celibacy. The only communities that can have any bearing on the question are the religious ones which have permitted and honored the family relation, and so far as their experience goes it cannot be said that communism exhibits anything more than the normal rate of increase.

2. *That communism requires an absolute and highly centralized government.* Successful communism does not appear to be compatible with the principle of popular rule. Communism can endure only where there is no encroachment by which one individual tries to consume more than his share or escape his part of the common burden. This seems to require a strict discipline. In convents and military barracks, where a communal existence prevails to a certain extent, absolute obedience to authority is the first requirement. The Icarian communities were pure democracies, and both the spirit of dissension and the poor business management, which attended their whole career, are largely ascribable to the lack

of a strong government concentrated in the hands of the most capable. On the other hand, those communities which have been the most successful have been characterized by an almost military discipline exercised by some central authority proceeding from either a monarchical or an aristocratic form of government. The Shakers will serve as an excellent illustration of this. Their government is vested in a ministry composed of two persons of each sex appointed for life by the head minister, who is the oldest of the four in point of service. This makes the Shaker ministry a self-perpetuating body. Its authority in all matters of government and business management is absolute, and it is only morally responsible to the membership of the society. It is very largely owing to their highly centralized government that the Shakers throughout their long history have been singularly free from the dissensions and disruptions that have attended the more democratic forms of government. The logical outcome of the democratic principle of government, when applied to communism, seems to be anarchy, and anarchistic communism is an impossible ideal.

4. *That communism requires isolation.* It would seem that successful communism contains within itself the seeds of its own decay. For every step on the way to material prosperity, not only stimulates anew the ambition to amass wealth, but also makes economic independence and self-sufficiency more and more impossible. A high degree of industrial development is in itself integrating. It makes for mutual dependence and social solidarity. It creates the give and take of the commercial world, and with the interchange of commodities there goes the inevitable interchange of ideas. The door is opened still wider to outside influences when a community is compelled to depend on large bodies of hired laborers to carry on its industries. The young are strongly impressed when there is close contact with the outside world, and as they catch glimpses of the larger opportunities which the world has to offer the old aims and ideas gradually lose their hold.

That communism affords little scope for ambition cannot well be denied, however much it may be glossed over. Its life is too narrow and commonplace to satisfy the cravings of larger natures, whereas for smaller ones it may be altogether satisfying. What was comfort and rich contentment to the German peasant of the eighteenth century who founded Harmony and Zoar would have been insufferably hard and empty to the cultured idealists who organized Brook Farm. Wherever, then, communism takes the form of sporadic societies in easy touch with the outside world, the tendency is that the best energy and talent is drawn off by the superior attractions of the world. This must prove fatal sooner or later unless counteracting influences can be devised.

5. *That communism must be religious.* This underlies all the other conditions of successful communism. It would seem from the history of communism that only a positive religious faith, a peculiar religious belief or practice, which is regarded as of primary importance and held almost to the point of fanaticism, is strong enough to hold men together in mutual love and service. It is conceivable of course that other interests might be able to secure the unity of mind and purpose necessary for successful communism. But as a matter of fact none has ever done so.

It is only in religious communities, too, that the proper discipline is secured. It is easy to see that nothing would so foster that spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice, and that absolute reverence for authority, so essential to successful communism, as the belief that a leader is supernaturally inspired and his system divinely revealed. Theocracy is what is needed for communism, not anarchism.

The holding of a peculiar religious belief is likewise the most favorable condition for that isolation and segregation, which has characterized the most successful experiments in communism. For communism, at least, religious differences have proved more effective social barriers than differences of race, nationality or custom.

It must be evident from the most cursory examination of the history of communism that small isolated communities, composed of kindred spirits with common religious aims and interests, can succeed. But the philosophy of secularist communism is not satisfied with such a sporadic exhibition of its principles. Its ambition is to conquer entire nations. But the absolute failure of secularist communism in the past leaves no hope for its ultimate triumph through the gradual extension of the voluntary principle. Such an outcome is even more impossible to-day than a century ago; for communism is clearly at variance with certain evident and growing tendencies of modern society. The leading states of the world are not now moving towards the autonomy of local communities and the suppression of national government, but towards a larger solidarity of social interests, towards the extension of the sphere of government, towards centralization in both legislation and administration. But even if it were possible to take the first step in the program of secularist communism, and substitute at one stroke independent communes for national government, it would not accomplish the deeper aims of communism. There would then be rich communes and poor ones, and the only effect would be that inequality of local groups would have taken the place of inequality of individuals.

LANCASTER, PA.

## VI.

### WHAT AND HOW TO PREACH.

BY THE REV. CHARLES E. CREITZ.

A brief word of explanation may be necessary to justify the apparent presumption by the author in the discussion of the above title. The subject was assigned to him for an address to the Seminary students at Lancaster, at their recent Missionary Conference. I trust that this will be a sufficient excuse also for the somewhat familiar form of speech employed throughout the paper.

Proper humility should perhaps have kept me from accepting the invitation to speak to you on the subject that has been assigned to me. It appears almost like presumption to tell a body of seminary students what and how to preach, for you know that better now than you will probably ever know it hereafter. You have been studying the science of homiletics and of practical theology under competent leadership. The whole curriculum of this institution looks toward the proper fitting out of the preacher. The aim of your professors is to make of you workmen of whom they need not be ashamed.

But there are some things which the seminary cannot do. The world of actual experience rudely shatters many of our plans, and confounds or at least modifies much of the wisdom that has come to us in the study and in the class room.

The life of the world is so fresh and abounding; the progress of the race is so bewilderingly rapid; and the factors of our civilization are so complex and manifold, that most of our cut-and-dried theories are soon consigned to the museum of antiquities, or given a burial from which there is no resurrection.

Only a living and growing theology appeals to the intellect of our day, and only the pulpit that throbs with fresh and vital truth, adapted to the immediate needs of the people, can hope to get the ear and conscience of this generation.

While truth in a certain sense is never either new or old, it requires ever new application to the changed and constantly changing conditions of life, and thought and experience.

It is for this reason that no one can ever tell you just what to preach and how, except in the most general terms. And yet there is no more difficult problem that confronts the preacher of our day than the question, What shall I preach? for his work in the world must be done largely through the agency of preaching. His throne is his pulpit, and his sceptre is his sermon. Grave danger threatens the sermon in these days. The preacher seems to be undergoing a metamorphosis into an administrator, an executive or a general. His study is becoming an office with telephone, stenographer and typewriter attachments. He is rapidly becoming a manager of societies, guilds, teas and sociables. In many cases the mere administrative work of the congregation absorbs nearly all his time and energy.

Then there is the persistent and apparently growing demand that the sermon shall be cut short. The preacher must measure his discourse by the clock, and not by the requirements of his theme. Congregations are probably not to be blamed alone for this state of affairs. The pulpit has no doubt contributed as much or more to the creation of this demand as the pew. Our wonder should probably be, not that we have so few hearers but so many.

The facts, however, cannot be disputed. It behooves the preacher, therefore, to give this problem his most serious consideration. How can the sermon be restored to its proper place in Christian worship? The answer must come from the side of the pulpit. Men will not be cowed or scolded into coming to church and listening to our sermons, neither will they

come merely for the sake of worship, in the Protestant church, where the priest is in the background and the prophet is to the fore. Our preaching must draw them—not eloquence and rhetoric, though these are important, but the substance of our message. Men will go where they get help and power.

What then is preaching? I do not propose to give you an exhaustive definition, but only to point out two or three of the factors that enter into any right conception of what preaching really is. It is in the first place, speaking for God. The preacher is an ambassador. He comes with a message and he comes with authority. While it may be said that other men also can and may speak for God, yet the preacher is a messenger of God in a unique, in a special sense. He is a man, like John, sent from God to do a special work, to declare His counsel and make known His will.

This at once excludes from his message all personal and private opinions, except as they are so understood. As Paul distinguished between his own ideas and those that he received by revelation, so the preacher needs to be careful, lest he make God say some foolish thing which has arisen only out of his own brain.

We are constantly in danger of substituting science, history, philosophy and criticism for the pure word of revelation. God undoubtedly speaks to man through all these channels. They also form a part of His revelation to man. But it remains true, nevertheless, that none of these can take the place of the Bible, as a record of God's revealed will and ways. Mere natural or worldly culture has never answered the world's need and never will. Only as the preacher lives in God's word and that word lives in him can he hope to get the message to which a lost world is ever ready to listen. When we can say, "Thus saith the Lord," in such a way that men will believe it and feel that it is true, they will hang eagerly on our lips.

Again, the preacher speaks to the soul and in the interests of the soul. His business is to convince men of sin, and to lead

them to repentance and salvation from sin. There is a loud and persistent clamor to draw the preacher away from his primary mission. He is invited to enter the field of politics and sociology, of trade and commerce. The preacher must under no circumstances stand aloof from any of the interests of his people. But if he fails to recognize the fact that his business is with the spiritual and moral health and soundness of the men and women who make the political and social, the industrial and commercial world, he has mistaken his mission.

I know that the church and her ministry are constantly challenged to show a valid reason for their existence. The cry is, "Of what use are ministers, anyway? What practical thing have they ever accomplished? Why does not the church under their leadership settle strikes, inaugurate prohibition or at least secure local option, elect decent candidates to office, bring about a more equitable distribution of wealth, stop child-labor or change the conditions which seem to make it necessary," etc.

The best answer to this challenge is, that the church is engaged in a greater and more difficult, and yet also a more promising task. Her work is not on the surface but at the heart of things. No reorganization of society or industry or government can bring about permanent changes for the better, so long as the human heart remains unchanged. Permit the spirit of greed and selfishness and unbrotherliness to remain, and the strong and the unscrupulous will find a way to rob and despoil, no matter what the outward social or political organization may be. The outward body of civilization changes just according to the necessities of the inner life and spirit of society. One can not mechanically manufacture an organization and then bid the soul move in and inhabit it. History is a living, growing thing, and the spirit and life of every age fashions for itself a body that will make a more or less adequate abode for the soul of the age.

It is true that the outward form has a reflex influence on the inner spirit. The state of the body conditions to some extent

the health of the soul. Environment is one of the powerful forces at work in the building of character; but one can easily overestimate its power and value. That which is within is always primary and fundamental. Identically the same environment is constantly producing diametrically opposite characters.

There is a feeling abroad, that if we could bring about proper changes in the outward organization of society, all our problems would speedily be solved. The Kingdom of God on earth has loomed large in the thought and vision of many modern thinkers and dreamers, and justly so; but that Kingdom will come only in the degree that the Church will be instrumental in creating a renewed humanity.

Again and again have men felt themselves right on the threshold of a perfect order of society. The city of God has repeatedly gleamed before men's vision, all ready to be taken possession of at once. This has been true from Plato with his Republic to the latest propagandists with an infallible scheme for a perfect state. But man's paradise has always been farther off than he dreamed. It is pathetic how often men's hopes for a new order of society have been dashed to the ground. Some one has said of the perfect state, the perfect church and the perfect brotherhood, that their gestation is long because their quality is so high. They will come in due time. But they will come in the order of growth and development.

Let us not deceive ourselves, therefore, with the vain hope that by forsaking the true mission of the pulpit, and entering on a mere program of social reform, we can bring in the Kingdom any sooner.

Let me not be misunderstood, however, as intimating that the social, political and industrial movements of our day are foreign to the pulpit. We cannot, we dare not stand aloof from the great problems that are convulsing society from center to circumference and retain the respect of thoughtful men. God has something to say on these problems and the preacher must say it for Him, if the people are to hear it. Shall the

pulpit remain silent when the victims of intemperance, and lust and greed are crying to God to plead their cause? When his ambassadors and representatives hold their tongue, how shall He make known His will? But the Church must never forget that her first task is one of regeneration, not of reformation. If she allows herself to be drawn away from her true mission, she is always in danger of committing a fatal error. History has not left us without a warning. When the Church sought to lay hold on civil government as an agency for promoting the interests of the Kingdom, and entered into ways where God did not clearly send her, the result was disgrace and disaster. She accomplishes most when she sticks to her primary mission—the giving of a new heart to humanity.

In the third place the preacher brings a Saviour, *the* Saviour to a lost and ruined world. He knows that there is no remedy for this world's ills outside of a new creation in Christ Jesus. Preaching means bringing this Saviour into real, vital touch with the world's needs, and with men. What a glorious privilege!

From these considerations it will be seen that preaching differs from every other form of human service. Young men are sometimes tempted to believe that they can serve God and His Kingdom just as well in business, in law, in politics, etc., as in the Christian ministry. Some of them no doubt can, but surely there is no other office to which men can aspire that affords the opportunity for such direct and telling service to God and one's fellowmen as the ministry of the Gospel of His Son.

If preaching means all that we have said, the great question still remains, "But what shall be the real substance of our message? If we are to speak for God and to souls; if we are to bring the Saviour to a lost world by our preaching, how shall this be done?" Perhaps the only safe thing for me to say is, that I cannot tell you what to preach, and I do not think that any one else can. Yet this does not prevent one from giving such assistance as lies in his power.

In a general way we may say, preach the Gospel, or more specifically yet, preach Christ. That has become a standing admonition to preachers in our day. But, just what is it to preach Christ? It is easy enough to preach about Him. The material for sermons about Christ is inexhaustible, and much of it intensely stimulating and interesting; but that is not necessarily preaching Christ.

Young men, believe me, you cannot give to another what you do not possess yourself. You cannot preach Christ unless you possess Christ, and you can only preach so much of Him as you have of Him in your own life and experience. You may talk learnedly about food, but you cannot feed people unless you have bread to give them. A man may know all about the laws of music—harmony, melody, color, tone, etc., and he may interest an audience by a lecture on music, but he is not giving them music, only something about music.

If the preacher, therefore, is to preach Christ, he must have the life of Christ in his own soul. Sometimes men are perplexed when they are told to preach Christ and not about Him. They ask "How can we preach Christ without preaching about him?" That is a fair question. The answer is that you can not preach Christ without preaching about Him, but that you can preach about Christ without preaching Christ, and the difference between the two kinds of sermons lies largely in the preacher and not in the outward form of the sermons. "My words are spirit and they are life." That makes the difference. The words of the true preacher must also be spirit and life, and that which gives them this spirit and life is the Christ incarnate in the preacher.

Abstract truth, even abstract goodness does not change men's lives. Personal truth, personal goodness alone have power in the realm of personality. You must have personal experience of Christ, if you want to preach Him, and that no seminary can give you; that no preacher from abroad can give you.

A course in theology and history is important. A knowledge of homiletical science is an invaluable aid to the preacher.

It furnishes rules and hints of which he can not afford to be ignorant. But unless we know the Gospel no amount of rules can help us to preach it. The whole theory of food and nutrition avail nothing to the man who has nothing to eat. So to know how to preach when we have nothing to preach avail-eth nothing.

"In preaching," said Julius Hare, "the thing of least importance is the sermon." "The man behind the gun" became a popular phrase during the Spanish-American war, and we have come to the habit of speaking of the "man behind the sermon." The man is always more important than the gun, but that does not exclude the necessity of the gun, and other things being equal, the better the gun the greater and more certain the results. So, while it is true that the preacher is more important than the sermon, it is also true that, other things being equal, the better the sermon the greater the results.

Taking it for granted now that the preacher is the living embodiment of the Gospel which he proclaims, and that the Christ whom he presents to men has become incarnate in his own life, it is still true that the sermon is largely the medium through which he brings the truth and life of Christ into touch with his hearers. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that the preacher should know what form of words are best adapted to his purpose.

It is coming to be admitted more and more that nothing else can take the place of the Bible as a vehicle for conveying spiritual life and truth to the world, and there is a growing conviction that Biblical preaching alone will satisfy the requirements of the age. The Bible must be allowed to speak for God more than has been the case in the immediate past. There is danger of mere human wisdom drowning out the voice of God in the world. We are constantly in danger of reading far more of what men have to say about the Bible, than of what God has to say in the Bible.

Nearly all the great preachers of the ages have been Biblical or expository preachers. The Bible is the revelation of a his-

toric process of redemption, and it is the preacher's business to mediate this redemption to a lost world. The sermon must still be a revelation rather than a lesson. The preacher's message is a gospel rather than a truth. He is not so much an educator as an evangelist, a declarer of good news. He offers a Saviour rather than a salvation. For this purpose he has no other weapon so effective as the Bible itself. In the degree that the Bible lives in him will he be able to mediate the truth and Saviour of the Bible to the world to which he ministers.

This is admittedly the most difficult kind of sermons to preach successfully, but surely difficulties should not be allowed to stand in the way of a great work such as has been committed to us. We must go to our Bible. We must study it anew. In this quarry we should dig day and night. The richest strikes for our purpose can be made here. Whatever else we may need this is fundamental. Science, literature, history, philosophy and art can never take precedence over the Bible. Here lies our danger. We are tempted to give more time to natural than to spiritual culture. We devote more study to the discoveries and philosophizing of men than to the revealed word of God, and so our sermons take the form of addresses, or lectures, rather than that of messages from the Most High God. We argue and reason, and seek to persuade, when we should reveal and declare and enforce.

We do not minimize the function of reason in the Christian life, but if we could report more of things that we have seen and know, we should need less argument and persuasion to make men believe.

Surely this was the method of Jesus. "We speak that we do know and testify that we have seen." He rarely or never enters into a discussion of any question that is asked of Him. In reply to the repeated interrogations of Nicodemus, he simply reiterates substantially his former statement, "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Even where Isaiah makes Jehovah say, "Come now and let

us reason together," he immediately adds the declaration, "though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow, and though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."

No other form of preaching will make it so possible for us to say, "Thus saith the Lord," as Biblical preaching, and this is the word that needs to be said with emphasis and authority in our day.

When my advice to you is to adopt the expository sermon for your model, I, of course, do not mean to imply that there is no other legitimate form of preaching. I only mean that this should be our aim, to be skilled in the use of God's word, and in the main to follow that method of preaching. I believe that the most efficient style of sermon for the average preacher of the coming day is the Biblical or expository. This kind of sermon makes room for all that I have said belongs to true preaching, and furnishes the most effective channel for bringing the Christ of God, the Saviour of the world into real touch with human lives and human needs.

It remains but to add a few words on the "How" in addition to what is implied in that which I have already said. Here, also, the preacher is above the method. If we tell you to preach with authority for instance, we do not mean to imply that you get authority by the tone of your voice, or the vigor of your gestures, or the tilt of your head. There is only one kind of authority that men will almost instinctively obey, and that is neither pope, nor Bible, nor any such thing, but superior intelligence, superior goodness, superior character. You cannot make other people do what you are not willing to do yourself. You cannot make other people believe what you do not believe yourself.

Dr. Woodrow Wilson said somewhere, that there are two classes of beings that assess character instantly by looking into the eyes—dogs and children. If a dog not naturally possessed of the devil, will not come to you, after he has looked you in the face, you ought to go home and examine your conscience, and if a little child from any other reason than mere timidity,

looks you in the face and then draws back and will not come to your knee, go home and look deeper into your conscience.

But this is true not only of dogs and children; it is a characteristic of simplicity everywhere. The preacher, especially, if he wants to speak with authority, must look carefully after his own character. Men will not go to drink merely because you tell them to, but where a well of water has been opened to slake the thirst of men, thither the weary and faint will go for quickening and refreshment. Where power is dealt out, men will go and get it without being ordered to do so.

It goes without saying that preaching should be distinct and lucid and comprehensible. Nehemiah is still our best teacher on this point. "And they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly; and they gave the sense, so that the people understood the reading."

We are usually told that our preaching should have a definite aim. The supposed lack of such an aim on the part of preachers no doubt inspired the article in the late number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, entitled "The Colonel in the Theological Seminary," in which the author argues that in addition to the usual professors of the theological seminary, one should be added who could teach the science of religious military tactics. To show the need of such a department, he reports a sermon to which he had recently listened. "At first," he says "I attributed to him (that is the preacher) a masterly strategy, in so long concealing his true objective. He was, I thought, only reconnoitering in force before calling up his reserves and delivering a decisive blow at an unexpected point. At last the suspicion came that he had no objective, and that he didn't even know that he should have one. He had never pondered the text about the futility of fighting as one that beateth the air. As we came away a parishioner remarked, 'That was a fine effort this morning.' 'An effort at what?' I inquired." The importance of having a definite aim in preaching could not be put more pointedly.

Much of the impressiveness of the sermon depends upon the

method of delivery. The sermon may be written out in full and then read from manuscript in the pulpit, or it may be committed to memory and recited before the congregation; or it may delivered extemporaneously. In either case adequate preparation is presupposed. No one can lay down dogmatic rules as to which of these methods should be used by the individual preacher. All of them have yielded unquestioned success, and each has its pulpit champions.

Of one thing there can be no doubt, however, viz., that the average congregation is averse to the manuscript in the pulpit. Some one has said, "It may be in the head, in the pocket, on the desk at home, or in the fire, no one asks its whereabouts or cares, so long as it is not in the pulpit." I am decidedly of the opinion that the strongest case can be made out in favor of the extemporaneous sermon. The read sermon may do for the elect, or the select, but it is not the sermon for the average church goer.

Of all methods the memorized sermon is probably the last one that should be adopted, though great preachers have followed it with eminent success; but for the average preacher it is far too slavish and laborious to be effective.

It seems to me that the aim of every preacher should be, freedom from the use of the manuscript, although the individual in each instance must be the final judge.

Our one aim should be to spare neither time nor effort in the preparation to make our pulpit ministrations as effective as possible. Let every preacher learn to know himself and his people, and above all to know Jesus Christ, and then let him preach, preach Christ, preach Him in love, preach Him in all His divine fullness, preach Him by lip and life, preach Him for the solution of all our problems, and preach Him with the joy and enthusiasm of one who already sees the victory!

READING, PA.

## VII.

### EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

#### COLLECTIVISM vs. INDIVIDUALISM.

About fifteen years ago Mr. Benjamin Kidd, in his *Social Evolution*, described the process of transformation which modern society is undergoing as one in which the masses first gained their political emancipation and after that began the struggle for their industrial emancipation. The aim was at first to gain political equality, and now it is to gain equality of industrial opportunity. The motive power behind the movement, he says, is to be found in the fund of altruistic sentiment lodged in the community at large, the product not of intelligence but of religion as a creative and stimulating force among the generality of men. The advantage would seem to have been on the side of the few. Intelligence, wealth, position and power were all in the hands of the existing order; and yet at every shifting of position in the social movement there was progress towards larger freedom and a greater share for the masses in the management of public affairs until the enfranchisement of the masses was secured. It was like the movement of a glacier by expansion and contraction, always down the slope, never in the other direction. The result was the triumph of individualism. Equal political rights having been secured for all, "the highest good of the community was then to be secured by allowing the individuals to work out their own social salvation (or damnation) amid the free and unrestricted play of natural forces, within the community, hampered by the least possible interference from government."<sup>1</sup>

Whether or not we accept Mr. Kidd's explanation of the

<sup>1</sup> *Social Evolution*, p. 200.

process, it is undoubtedly true that the era of enlarged freedom which dawned upon the world brought with it an age of keen competition and rivalry in which the stronger and more skillful secured tremendous advantages, and the weaker went to the wall or were ground down in toil and drudgery. The enormous growth of capital in the hands of the skillful and the ability to use improved means of production to better advantage led to the large combinations in manufactures and the establishment of plants which control the market and drive the small producer out of the field. Ruinous competition is to be eliminated by combination. But meanwhile a fatal antagonism is growing between the Haves and the Have-nots, and the cry goes up, not only for equal industrial opportunities, but also for an equal enjoyment of the good things of this world as the fruit of one's labor.

Which way lies the road out of what is undoubtedly a difficult situation? That the situation is difficult needs no argument. It is only necessary to look at the haughtiness, immorality, and tyranny of many who possess large wealth, and the jealousy, bitterness and hatred of others who pose as workmen and claim for their labor an equal reward with the former and which they think is wrongfully withheld. The remedy is not in the hands of either of the classes to which we have referred. They have minds hostile towards each other, and there is as much blame attaching to the workman who does not hesitate to injure and destroy the property of his employer to gain his end, as to the employer who disregards the rights and interests of his workmen. Destructive nihilists and ruthless capitalists are both hindrances rather than helps to those who seek for a solution. But, certainly, there are many men of large means who are large-hearted, generous, openminded, and many workmen who recognize the eternal principles of right and justice not only when they bear in their favor but also when they determine their relation to others. It may be assumed, therefore, that when not in the heat of battle, all such, and particularly the large body of

men and women not so directly involved in labor troubles, those who are sincerely animated by the spirit of humanity and Christian civilization, are anxiously looking for a solution of the problem which so sorely vexes the present age.

It is felt on all sides that the extreme individualism which has resulted from the enlarged freedom which men have achieved needs to be curbed and held in check; that the weak should be protected against the strong, that the poor should have a fair chance as ever against the rich. The watchword of modern society, we are told, ought to be not competition but coöperation. There is certainly a kind of ruinous competition, and that should be removed; so there is a kind of coöperation that is eminently desirable, and all good men should strive for it. To secure both the one and the other the tendency now is to invoke the strong arm of government, and there are many earnest men in the field both of politics and religion who think that the evils from which we suffer can be overcome by a form of social organization in which the principle of production and distribution is expressed by the formula: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." The principle is that of collectivism, and that usually spells socialism.

It would seem, therefore, that for Hobbes's idea of man as a fighting animal, we must necessarily substitute that of Aristotle that he is a political animal, and that in place of the Leviathan of war, we must have the economy of the bee-hive. Undoubtedly the spirit of Christianity is that of love and it stands everywhere for a policy of coöperation. But when we are told that the founder of Christianity meant to found a kingdom in this world in which the state would own all public utilities and organize and carry forward the processes of production according to the formula stated above, we may well pause and take sober thought. Christianity is concerned, above all, with the highest human interests; it begins its work in the spirit and it regards secular interests as of secondary importance. Their value lies in the aid they render in work-

ing out a course of development which challenges all the powers of man and offers a field for their manifold activity under the influence of the benign spirit of the gospel. But Christianity, neither in the beginning nor at any stage of human history claimed to furnish a social system, neither communism, nor individualism, nor socialism. It recognizes the principles of human nature, and it exalts and purifies them so as to substitute love for selfishness. But it does not curb the freedom of initiative; it recognizes the principle of reward for service rendered; it approves of industry and fidelity in business; it sanctions trading with the talents so as to win more. It renders unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.

The picture of the state as socialism paints it, is a beautiful picture. But is the ideal capable of realization? There are men of transcendent ability, thank God, who serve the public not for filthy lucre nor for honor, but for the service which they render. But the number is small. And when we look at the generality of men who hold public office, and at the methods of politicians; when we see the spirit which animates most of our labor agitators, and the attitude of many of our laboring men; there is surely little ground for believing that socialism or collectivism, in the present condition of men's hearts, offers any hope of regenerating society.

Rufus W. Weeks, in *The Socialism of Jesus*, says that Jesus Christ had "the consciousness of the workingman." In one sense, no doubt, He had. It is, however, of more importance that the workingman should have *the conscience of Jesus*. If the spirit of conscientiousness in the discharge of duty and of love for all men could be enthroned in the hearts of both capitalists and laborers, the kingdom of heaven would surely come. And just here is where the workers for reform must begin. The true social order is that which makes room for the free development of individuality and the healthy organization of society. Here lies the mission of Christianity if it

is to have a voice in the changing social order. It must lay hold of the individual but it must also make him labor for the welfare of all. It must make a man pure, honest, unselfish; but it must also beget the spirit which demands purity, honesty and unselfishness in others. When men have come to that point that they discharge their public duties and exact civic virtue from those who hold public office, when conscientious service may be looked for throughout the whole fabric of society, then the state may be organized on socialist principles. Oh no! then, perhaps, it will not be necessary.

J. S. S.

OTTO PFLEIDERER.

The brief space in which Professor Pfleiderer's death was announced in the newspapers and periodicals, was a scant recognition of his world-wide influence as a philosopher and a theologian. For twenty-five years his lectures were heard not only by the matriculated students of many lands in the Berlin University, but by throngs of visitors who were eager to come into personal touch with the distinguished scholar. As an author, no less than as a lecturer, he was a teacher in Great Britain and America as well as in Germany. His books circulate in the orient and are read by Japanese scholars especially. He was more of a traveller than a German professor usually is. On two occasions he visited Great Britain. In 1885 he delivered the Hibbert Lectures in London and Oxford. His subject was "The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity." In 1894 he was the Gifford Lecturer in the University of Edinburgh. Professor Orr characterized his lectures as having "sustained power of thought, felicity of diction, and often lofty eloquence and religious fervor." Still, on account of their anti-supernaturalism and rationalism, the authorities shortly afterwards offered a special course on "Christian Revelation." Thus the negations of the Berlin professor were to be counteracted by three lectures, delivered successively by Professors Rainy,

Orr and Dods. During the last decade of his life he came to America at least twice. He attended the Congress of Scholars at the St. Louis Exposition in 1904. He was a member of the International Council of Unitarians and Other Religious Liberals, which met in Boston in 1907. It is said that in his address before the Council "the scholarship and spiritual insight of this great convention reached their highest point."

The story of his life is readily told. He was born at Stetten, near Cannstadt, Würtemberg, Germany, September 1, 1839. He became a pupil of the celebrated critic and historian, Professor Baur, in the University of Tübingen from 1857 to 1861. In 1868 he was chosen to be pastor at Heilbronn. He was appointed superintendent at Jena in 1870, and there became an ordinary professor of theology the same year. He was called to the Theological Faculty of the Berlin University in 1875. Here he remained until he died, the twentieth of July last.

His fame will be perpetuated by his publications, which are not only numerous but, as a rule, standard authorities on the various subjects treated. They are extensively circulated in several languages. His more prominent books were the following: "Die Religion, ihr Wesen und ihre Geschichte," 2 vols., 1869; "Moral und Religion," 1870; "Der Paulinismus," 1873; "Religionsphilosophie auf geschichtlicher Grundlage," 1878; "Grundriss der Christlichen Glaubens- und Sittenlehre," 1880; "The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity" (Hibbert Lectures), 1885; "Das Uhrchristenthum," 2 vols.; "Evolution and Theology and other Essays," edited by Orello Cone, 1900; "Early Christian Conceptions of Christ," 1905; "Die Entstehung des Christenthums; "Die Entwicklung des Christenthums," 1907; "Religion und Religionen," 1906. The substance of the last three volumes was delivered "before students of all faculties, and visitors—ladies and gentlemen—in the Berlin University." They are designed for popular use. He also contributed liberally to

the periodical literature of his time, notably to Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*.

After this brief review of his life and work it is appropriate to consider his philosophical and theological positions. He is classed with the liberal rationalistic school, strongly influenced by the philosophy of Hegel and the critical method of Baur. He is associated in theology with Biedermann and Lipsius. Dr. Schaff says of him: "He was one of a group who revived the positive and constructive elements of the old rationalistic theology on the basis of the Hegelian Philosophy." He sharply distinguished his position from traditional orthodoxy, from mediationalism, and from Ritschianism. Throughout his life he was a vigorous polemicist, always on the side of the minority, and never rode on the crest of the wave of popularity. He seemed to be the champion of a dying cause, and the last of a passing and yet once influential school. In his later years, however, "his studies in the history of religion formed a connecting link between him and the newest theological tendencies in Germany, the so-called *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*."

As a philosopher, he was an idealistic monist. He based his thinking on the presupposition that the "Divine Logos is the ground of the universe and rules in history."<sup>1</sup> To follow the manifold phenomenal forms of the Logos is the task of science. He contended earnestly for the consistent application of the scientific method to all the phenomena of nature and history. The material universe, as well as the totality of historical development, is the progressive manifestation of the Logos in the forms of time and space. This evolutionary process can be interpreted only by the method of scientific investigation. This method, he says, "is simply that of causal thinking, according to which every event is the necessary effect of causes whose operation is again determined by their connection with other causes." Miracles, in the traditional sense of the intervention of a supernatural power

<sup>1</sup> *Evolution and Theology*, p. 26.

in the natural course of events, are therefore necessarily excluded. The events and personalities of sacred history can be accounted for without the introduction of a transcendent or "foreign power," or of causes which are outside the causal connection of finite forces. Religion is a natural phenomenon because it is the necessary expression of the Divine Logos in the consciousness of man; in other words, "the human consciousness of God." Christianity is the highest stage of religious development hitherto reached, but not its absolute or final form; for the absolute cannot be found in the beginning of a process but in its consummation.<sup>2</sup> To use his own words on this important question we quote the following: "Christianity, however, was not already complete in Jesus, but its principle has also unfolded itself only in long series of forms of development, and we have every reason for assuming that it will still further develop and adapt itself to still newer conditions of life."

He also carefully differentiates his position from ancient and modern philosophical systems. He considers materialism, traditionalism and emanationism as "theories that contradict philosophical thinking no less than religious feeling."<sup>3</sup> He agrees with the Church in finding the exclusive ground of the world in the omnipotent will of God. Mind, and not matter, is the primary and the supreme reality. His opponents, however, charge him with denying the self-existent personality of God. Did God exist before all worlds? Is He independent of and separate from the world process? In the light of numerous statements in his writings, it is hard to answer these questions affirmatively. At one place he says: "The divine essence is the immanent, vital principle of the world process, which is manifested in the development of the universe."<sup>4</sup> When this statement is taken in connection with

<sup>2</sup>"The evolutionary method knows no absolute within the phenomenal world, but everywhere and always only the relative." Evolution and Theology, p. 25.

<sup>3</sup>Grundriss der christlichen Glaubens- und Sittenlehre, p. 92.

<sup>4</sup>Religionsphilosophie.

another in the same book, namely, "that His self-consciousness must be one with His world-consciousness, the latter being the developed totality of the former," it is difficult, indeed, to see how he can conserve the doctrine of divine personality, which is so essential to religion. We must not forget, however, that he speaks as a philosopher and wrestles with the most difficult of all problems—a rational definition of God and His relation to the universe. He aims to reconcile the scientific view of the world and the doctrines of Christianity. When one does this, it is always hard to steer clear of the Scylla of deism on the one hand, and the Charybdis of pantheism on the other.

It is interesting to observe in this connection how he conforms the dogma of the Trinity to his monistic philosophy. The eternal potency, which is the source of all things, is the Father. In religious phraseology we should say, the Father hath life in Himself and from Him all things proceed. The power, that goes forth from the being of God and creates finite things in general and finite spirits in particular, is the Son. In biblical language He is the One through whom all things become, the Life of the world, the Light of men. The union of the transcendent and immanent God—Father and Son—and His impartation to the finite spirit, helping men to realize the oneness between the divine and the human personality and to actualize the divine Sonship, is the Holy Spirit. He is neither purely divine nor purely human, but a union of both. He is the divine-human spirit in which divine grace becomes man's own volition and man's volition becomes a divine act in a new nature.<sup>5</sup>

In these speculations he satisfied neither the traditionalists nor the Ritschlians. His monism undermined the supernaturalism of the former. His philosophic temper and method were not in accord with the non-metaphysical theology of the latter. Professor Orr's criticism of the Gifford Lectures is a fair expression of the feeling of the orthodox school toward

<sup>5</sup>Grundriss, pp. 85, 143.

Professor Pfeiderer's position. He said: "The principal weakness of the Gifford Lectures is that he is not decidedly one thing or another. He will retain his faith in God, in a moral government of the world, in a divine purpose in history, in communion with God, in the ultimate triumph of the good over evil, in a coming Kingdom of God; but in combination with a philosophic view, which denies all miracles, or the possibility of the overstepping of the limits of the natural order, whether on the side of nature or the human spirit." His failure to distinguish between scientific and religious knowledge, which is one of the first principles of the Ritschlians, accounts for his secret antipathy toward that school. Referring to them, he says: "The fundamental errors of the theologians of the new faith of the present day consist in this, that they think one can, without hesitation, acknowledge the validity of the same scientific method in the domain of nature which they refuse to apply to that of history. There is only one choice; either the evolutionary mode of thought is right, in which case it must be uniform in all fields of investigation, in history as well as in nature; or it is wrong, in which case the views of nature acquired by means of it are not justified, and we have no right to prefer them to the traditions of faith."<sup>6</sup>

It is not difficult to surmise his views of Jesus from the premises which we have already considered. He, too, is regarded as a natural product of the evolutionary process, and described as "the most perfect blossom of the religious development of Judaism." He stood in exactly the same relation to His environment as all the other biblical and extra-biblical prophets. He was a child of His age and "with all His personal originality He was yet implicated in the ideas and limitations of the religion of His people." For example, he shared with them the expectation of a sudden and catastrophic coming of the Kingdom. He limited it to the Jewish people. He advocated the continuance of the Mosaic law and

<sup>6</sup> *Evolution and Theology*, p. 8.

His ethics was influenced by an ascetic spirit. It was Paul, indeed, who delivered Christianity from the limitations of the historical Jesus and translated it into terms of a spiritual Messiah. Prof. Pfleiderer clearly minimizes the significance of the person of Jesus. He was, therefore, never in sympathy with the Ritschlian cry "Back to Jesus." He would prefer the watchword "Forward to Christ." "Not to return to the old, whether it be called Athanasius, or Paul, or Jesus, can be the task of our time, but to clothe the Spirit of Christianity, its religious-ethical principle, which lay as a compelling force at the basis of all preceding developments, in a fitting and intelligible form for our age."

His christological position comes out clearly in his criticism of the liberal theologians whom he charges with inconsistency and with not differing in principle from the orthodox school. They, he affirms, will not know anything of an historical limitation of Jesus' character and work, of any positive causal connection whatever between His personality and His age. They look upon Him as "an immediate miracle from Heaven"; a man, indeed, in appearance, but superhuman, super-earthly, according to His divine nature, and hence to be reverenced by us as an "unconditional authority." This he considers a form of dualism or mediationalism. He is indeed willing to concede that the "God-consciousness" reached its highest point in Jesus and that "He stands among the first, yea is the very first, of those who have realized the ideal man of our species." But, "on the contrary, it is an hyperbole, excusable in poetic language but not scientifically valid when He is identified with the ideal humanity." That which is of permanent worth in the ancient christological dogmas, is not their interpretation of the person or doctrine of the historic Jesus, but the philosophical affirmation of the idea of a divine humanity, that is, that man, not only Christ, is essentially one with God.

His work entitled "Das Uhrchristentum," 2 vols., and his two recent books, the one on "The Origin of Christianity"

and the other on "The Development of Christianity," are notable contributions to church history. In his interpretation of the history of Christianity, he follows the method of the Tübingen school, though he differs from many of its conclusions. Of his teacher Baur he says: "Whatever the results of future investigations may be, we shall have to confess that our whole present and future historical studies of primitive Christianity are grounded upon the path-breaking and basal contributions of the great Tübingen master." He permits no opportunity to pass by to criticise the Ritschlian-Harnack theory of the history of the Church. That school finds the absolute and final form of Christianity in the gospel proclaimed by Jesus. All efforts to interpret Jesus' life and work, from Paul on, it regards as only partially successful. The centuries which follow the apostles present the discouraging spectacle of progressive secularization and deterioration in the Church—a pessimistic view of history which Pfleiderer's theory of development does not permit. Not until the Reformation was the gospel rediscovered, and even to-day our chief problem is to restore the Christianity of Jesus. To set up in Jesus an absolute at the beginning of the process, and then let the theology of the Church follow as a lapse from the truth, in order to bring us back again to the Jesus of history as the final definitive authority, he considers an unscientific procedure. He prefers the view that the religious principle of Jesus was freed by Paul "from its original Jewish and national husk," and that Paulinism was an advance beyond the teachings of Jesus. But Paul again clothed his message in a new, supernaturalistic envelope taken from Hellenism and Pharisaism. Therefore the Pauline Christ can just as little be for us a binding object of faith as the Jesus of history. It was another step in advance when the Christian principle was embodied in the form of Greek philosophy and Roman law, for in this way only could it become a moulding leaven in the ancient world, and a constructive principle in the middle ages. The Re-

formers broke away from one part of the ancient and mediæval forms but held fast to the other. The ethical ideals of mediævalism were given up but the old dogmas were preserved intact. Our task then, at present, is to strike off the dogmatic fetters of ecclesiastical Christianity and to clothe the gospel in modern garb. This work can be accomplished, not by a return to a primitive ideal. We must advance to a goal in the future. One can see him point his finger at the Ritschlian historians when he says: "Hence it is folly to set up a single phenomenon as a type by which to measure all others and to condemn all that does not correspond with it. It makes no essential difference from the scientific point of view whether the Catholic or the Lutheran or the Calvinistic dogma, or indeed no dogma but the so-called 'gospel of Jesus,' be set up as a standard; for every such dogmatic or rationalistic or pietistic judgment of the past, stands in contradiction with the scientific principle of evolution, according to which every stage of development in the process of history, as of nature, has its inner necessity and its unique adaptation to its end; but none of them can set up the claim of being the only justified, the *ne plus ultra*."

It is doubtful whether the theological views of Professor Pfleiderer will be more popular after his death than they were during his life. Scholars will of course continue to read his writings and to admire them for their critical acumen, their philosophical grasp, their dignified style, their vitality, consistency and honesty. He thoroughly understood the different tendencies of his age and spoke without equivocation or compromise. He thought so clearly and wrote so plainly that men could not fail to understand him. Even those who differ from him will not disdain to be pupils at his feet.

Yet in his zeal to apply consistently the scientific method and to escape ecclesiastical dogmatism and the "half way compact with science," he was none the less bound by a philosophic dogmatism which he inherited from his masters, Hegel and Baur. He makes all phenomena in nature and history con-

form to a theory of development, and is willing to stand or fall with his monistic view of the world and the evolutionary mode of thought. It is a question, mooted not only by traditional theologians but by scientists, whether this method will satisfactorily account for all phenomena. He approaches Christianity with a preconceived scheme of the origin and development of the universe. All the events and personalities of religion, Jesus included, are interpreted by and adjusted to his philosophy. He refuses to accept the person and life of Jesus as a spiritual finality, independent of philosophic systems or scientific methods. He leaves no room for *Glaubenserkenntniss* but attempts to comprehend all things in heaven and on earth by a process of ratiocination. Philosophy, in his view, is not the handmaid but the master of religion. The phraseology and symbolism of religion are necessary only for the common man. The "human consciousness of God" in successive ages, however, will always be finally embodied in a philosophical system. His idea of development in the history of the Church bears testimony to his philosophical interest in religion. He presents the several ages of church history in an apparently logical and consistent scheme, yet one is constrained to conclude that he is fitting facts into a theory.

The possibility of a new type of humanity, embodied in an individual who becomes the head of a new species, he does not grant. That there is an absolute and an unchangeable source from which the finite and temporal proceeds, the human mind has always, in one form or another, presupposed; but to affirm this now would, according to Professor Pfeiderer, not be scientific, and be contrary to the evolutionary method. That there was such an absolute before all worlds, that Jesus was the prototype of a new species of manhood in that He lived in new relations Godward, manward and earthward, we believe can be posited without doing violence to the constitution of the human mind nor to the facts of nature and history. It is clear, then, that he was at odds with contemporary theo-

logians in his philosophical presuppositions. Let these be granted and his conclusions in reference to religion, Christianity, and history will logically follow.

Yet when all is said about the radicalism and the anti-supernaturalism of the great scholar, it remains a fact almost universally attested by his students that he was an inspiring personality, an enthusiastic idealist, and a devout man. We cite the testimony of one of his American pupils who says: "He appears to have denied the supernatural, yet it is clear, too, that for him this God, who accomplishes his highest purposes through the forces and processes of the universe, is a personal, living, loving God, who is our Father, whose good pleasure it is to bring his children into spiritual accord with him. No one could trace with more loving enthusiasm the training, the educating grace of God even in the lower stages of the world's life, or emphasize more strongly the indwelling of His Spirit in the hearts of His people." Those who came into close personal contact with him in his class-room and in his villa at Gross-Lichterfeld, a Berlin suburb, were deeply impressed by his intense earnestness, unaffected piety, and lovable personality. His virile figure, his high forehead, his penetrating eye, and his perfect mastery of the subject, will never be forgotten by those who heard him lecture. And when, ever and anon, he turned away from his manuscript and spoke freely, the students forgot their note books, sat with breathless attention and felt their hearts burning within them as a master unfolded the wisdom of the ancients. His enthusiasm, so quiet and yet so subtle and pervasive, grew out of his firm faith in the essential oneness of God and man. When he breathed his last, not only did a German scholar pass away, but a great leader of men whose power was felt by students of two continents.

G. W. R.

## VIII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

**POSITIVE PREACHING AND MODERN MIND.** By P. T. Forsyth, M.A., D.D.  
The Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, Yale University, 1907.  
New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. Pages xii + 374. Price \$1.75 net.

Both the author and the occasion of this volume make it one of the notable recent theological publications. The lectures made a deep impression on the audience and since their appearance in print have attracted attention in England and America. They have been favorably noticed in secular and religious papers, and after thinking as well as reading his way through the book, one can understand the secret of its power and popularity. The style, no less than the contents, is thought-provoking. The author is fond of striking antitheses, pointed epigrams, suggestive allusions, and illuminating comparisons. He occupies a definite viewpoint and constantly differentiates his positions from orthodoxy and liberalism. In an autobiographical section (pp. 281-290) he permits the reader to see how he reached his theological conclusions for which he contends so vigorously on every page. He was reared as a student of the classics and of philosophy. For a time, in his early manhood, he applied the scientific method to the Bible in an academic way. But fortunately for him, as he thinks, he "was not condemned to the mere scholar's cloistered life." He became a pastor and has served in this office for more than thirty years. He says, "I could not contemplate conclusions without asking how they would affect these people, and my word to them in doubt, death, grief, or repentance." He became convinced that the members of the Church generally "were not in a spiritual condition to have forced on them those questions on which scholars so delighted and differed." They lacked "that reality of experience and that certainty of salvation which is the position of safety and command in all critical matters." His regard then for his audience or people modified his attitude toward the biblical problems.

Another modifying factor in his life was his own religious experience. He describes it as follows: "It also pleased God by the revelation of His holiness and grace, which the great theologians taught me to find in the Bible, to bring home to me my sin in a way that submerged all the school questions in weight, urgency, and poignancy. I was turned from a Christian to a

believer, from a lover of love to an object of grace. And so, whereas I first thought that what the Churches needed was enlightened instruction and liberal theology, I came to be sure that what they needed was evangelization, in something more than the conventional sense of that word. . . . There was something to be done, I felt, before they (the Churches) could freely handle the work of the scholars on the central positions. And that something was to revive the faith of the Churches in what made them Churches; to turn them from the ill-found sentiment which had sapped their faith; to reopen their eyes to the meaning of their own salvation; to recreate an experience of redemption, both profound and poignant, which should enable them to deal reasonably, without extravagance and without panic, with the scholar's results as these came in." We quote at length from this account of the author's experience because it throws light on his theological position, and explains the positive note that characterizes each chapter and the polemical tendency that is felt on almost every page. It is widely felt that the great problems of theology cannot be answered by the cloistered scholar alone. The scholar must be conversant with the religious needs of the people and must himself have the experience of redemption before he can with authority interpret the great religion of redemption. All these elements are combined in Dr. Forsyth, who is a profound scholar, an experienced pastor and preacher, and who "was turned from a Christian to a believer, from a lover of love to an object of grace."

The purpose of these lectures was primarily homiletical. They are lectures on preaching. But they are at the same time a dogmatic and a polemic; a dogmatic because they are based on a definite system of theology, and a polemic because the system is not only expounded as opportunity affords, but is differentiated from other systems with all the positiveness and force of one who owes his life to his message.

Three things are discussed in their various aspects in the nine chapters—the preacher, the gospel, the age. He distinguishes the preacher from the orator, the pulpit from the platform. "The orator comes with but an inspiration, the prophet comes with a revelation." The orator has for his business to make real and urgent the present world and its crises, the preacher a world unseen, and the whole crisis of two worlds. Demosthenes fires his audience to attack Philip straightway; Paul stirs them to die and rise with Christ. The note of the preacher is the gospel of a Saviour. The subjects of five of the lectures indicate the purpose of the author to define the preacher in the several relations in which he necessarily stands. They are the following: The Preacher and His Charter (the Bible); The Authority of the

Preacher; The Preacher and His Church; The Preacher and the Age; The Preacher and Religious Reality; The Preacher and Modern Ethic.

His conception of the gospel is especially noteworthy and one of the characteristic features of the volume. He assumes that "the gift to men in Christianity is the Gospel deed of God's grace in the shape of forgiveness, redemption, regeneration." By grace he means not merely "God's general benignity or His particular kindness to our failure or pity for our pain," but "His undeserved and unbought pardon and redemption of us in the face of our sin, in the face of the world-sin, under such moral conditions as are prescribed by His revelation of His holy love in Jesus Christ and Him crucified." He reiterates the statement that the gospel is an act of God and not merely a revelation of God's character. It is "not a statement, nor a doctrine, nor a scheme, on man's side; nor an offer, a promise, or a book, on God's side. It is an act and a power: it is God's act of redemption before it is man's message of it. It is an eternal, perennial act of God in Christ, repeating itself with each declaration of it. It is an objective power, a historic act and perennial energy of the holy love of God in Christ; decisive for humanity in time and eternity; and altering forever the whole relation of the soul to God, as it may be rejected or believed. It is this act that is prolonged in the word of the preacher, and not merely proclaimed. The great, the fundamental sacrament is the Sacrament of the Word." This act, that constitutes the gospel of the preacher, is not merely Christ coming into the world or His revelation of the Father, or His teaching generally, but it is Christ's death on the cross. "If sin be man's fatal act, the Cross is God's vital act." In the chapter on The Moral Poignancy of the Cross he emphasizes two points. First, that "no revelation of divine love to such a (sinful) world is possible unless the revelation is an act of redemption." Second, that "the redemption of man is inseparable from the satisfaction of God in an Atonement." It is evident that the author occupies the standpoint of Paul, begins with sinful man, feels the need of a redeemer by whom God and man are reconciled, and holds fast the doctrines of regeneration, justification, and sanctification. He has no patience with modern liberalism which reduces the gospel to a message of God's Fatherhood and man's sonship, makes Jesus simply the Messiah, the champion of humanity, the spiritual hero, the greatest prophet, the exquisite saint, instead of the Redeemer, and fails to distinguish incarnation from immanence, redemption from evolution, the Kingdom of God from mere spiritual progress, and the Holy Spirit from mere spiritual process. He is not satisfied with regarding Christ's work as a mere extension of our previous horizon, a supplement to nature

or a development of it, an enrichment of our previous mentality, a touch which unfolds the latent germ, or a case of slitting the husk or of eliciting the vitality. It is more than all this. It is revelation, a new creation, a free gift, an absolute salvation and not simply an aid to our self-salvation.

While Dr. Forsyth opposes the so-called liberal theology, he does not consider himself a traditionalist. He is friendly to biblical criticism, he freely accepts the results of scientific scholarship, he boldly renounces the old theory of inspiration, and he deplores the effort to "drag men back to the dogmas of scholastic protestantism." The first requirement of the ministry is a positive theology which is different from both orthodoxy and liberalism. In the sixth chapter this distinction is clearly made. Space does not allow us to outline it here. Preaching, too, must be modernized. The following elements in our age must be recognized by the theologian and preacher: the freedom of the individual from external authority, the social idea applied to salvation, the rescue of personality from individualism, the distinction, made by Kant, between theoretical and practical knowledge, the ethicizing of Christianity, the influence of evolution, the passion for reality. The positive doctrines which, amid all that is modernized in it, make Christianity still a gospel of the Grace of God are the Eternal Sonship, the Mediatorship, and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

We have read and re-read this book with great profit. It magnifies the office of the preacher. It clearly defines his message, and it analyzes the tendencies of our age with keen penetration. It cannot fail to be a source of instruction and inspiration to the student of theology and the minister of the gospel.

**BOOKS FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY.** An Annotated List for Popular and Professional Use. By John Merlin Powis Smith, The University of Chicago. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1908. Price, postpaid, \$0.54. Pages 70.

Dr. Smith's work along Old Testament lines, up to within a few years ago, lies embedded in the publications of his famous teacher, the late President Harper. Dr. Smith for a number of years stood in very intimate relations with Dr. Harper, as a student, as an assistant, and as a colleague. By his assistance Dr. Harper, in his later years when the executive duties of a large university devolved upon him, was enabled to publish the works that appeared under his name. Dr. Harper always freely acknowledged his indebtedness to Dr. Smith. So, for instance, in the preface to Amos and Hosea in the International Critical Commentary, not to mention other publications, Dr. Harper says:

"In conclusion I wish particularly to acknowledge the help which has been given me in the preparation of the volume by my

former pupil, now my colleague, Dr. John M. P. Smith. The assistance which he has rendered in gathering material, in verifying references, and in revising the manuscript and the printer's sheets, and the suggestions which he has made from time to time upon the subject-matter itself, have been of the greatest value. Without this help I doubt whether I should have been able to bring the work to a completion."

Since the death of President Harper, Dr. Smith has published various articles which characterize him as a diligent and painstaking student of the Old Testament. In this connection we recall his article in the *American Journal of Theology*, Vol. X. (1906), "The Rise of Individualism among the Hebrews," as also his three articles in the *Biblical World* of the current year under the general title "The Biblical Doctrine of Atonement." The first of these articles is entitled "Atonement in Preprophetic Israel"; the second, "Atonement in the Prophets and Deuteronomy"; and the third, "Atonement in the Later Priestly Literature." The *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, January, 1908, contains also a reprint of his scholarly and technical contribution to the *Harper Memorial Volumes*, on "The Strophic Structure of the Book of Micah."

While, on the one hand, the articles to which we have referred characterize Dr. Smith as a diligent, painstaking and scholarly student of the Old Testament, on the other hand, the work to which we especially call attention in this notice characterizes him at once as one of the foremost bibliognosts among Old Testament students in this country. The aim of the work is best characterized by a few sentences taken from the brief prefatory note: "No effort is made to be exhaustive. The purpose is rather to include only such books as are of real importance and value. Articles in encyclopedias and magazines are for the most part excluded for lack of space, though the best work in some departments is on record in this form. Books of homiletical and devotional character are not included here."

We reproduce the table of contents, which is well adapted to give the reader of this notice an idea of what is included in the list.

#### I. History.

(1) Geography of Western Asia and Palestine; (2) History of Israel; (3) History of Peoples Related to Israel; (4) The Old Testament and the Monuments.

#### II. Introduction to the Old Testament.

(1) The Entire Old Testament; (2) The Hexateuch; (3) The Remaining Books; (4) The Canon of the Old Testament; (5) Dictionaries of the Bible; (6) The Nature and Value of the Old Testament.

**III. *The Language and Text of the Old Testament.***

(1) The Hebrew Text; (2) The Ancient Versions; (3) Modern Versions; (4) Hebrew Grammar; (5) Hebrew Lexicons; (6) Aramaic and Syriac Grammar; (7) Aramaic and Syriac Lexicons; (8) Concordances; (9) Quotations from the Old Testament in the New Testament.

**IV. *Interpretation.***

(1) Commentaries on the Entire Old Testament; (2) Commentaries on the Separate Books of the Old Testament, (*a*) The Hexateuch, (*b*) The Historical Books, (*c*) The Psalter, (*d*) The Wisdom Literature (*e*) The Major Prophets, (*f*) The Minor Prophets; (3) Old Testament Prophecy; (4) The Religion of the Hebrews, (*a*) Primitive Semitic Religion, (*b*) The Religions of Israel's Neighbors, (*c*) Hebrew Manners, Customs, and Institutions, (*d*) The Religion of the Old Testament, (*e*) Special Phases of the Religion of the Old Testament.

**V. *Miscellaneous Books.*****VI. *The Old Testament Apocrypha.*****VII. *Periodical Publications.***

(1) American; (2) British; (3) French; (4) German; (5) Dutch.

We have more than once been consulted for recent reliable books on different phases of Old Testament study. This leads us to believe that our pastors, Sunday school superintendents, Sunday school teachers, and the intelligent laity generally, who are interested in modern Old Testament study, will be glad to know of this annotated list of books on the different phases of this subject. For the teachers of the Old Testament in colleges and theological seminaries this annotated list of books is very helpful. Indeed, now since we have it, it seems to us almost next to indispensable.

IRWIN HOCH DeLONG.

**MR. CREWE'S CAREER.** By Winston Churchill. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages 498. Price \$1.50.

Mr. Churchill dedicates his latest volume "to the men who in every State of the Union are engaged in the struggle for purer politics." Mr. Crewe's Career is, in short, a political novel. Its severity is, however, relieved by an all-pervasive humor; its sordidness is softened by the most idyllic of love stories. In its vivid portraiture of public men and its intimate exposition of railroad politics the author's own personal experiences in his crusade against the Imperial Railroad of New Hampshire are clearly reflected. It is a book to make one laugh and blush by turns, and, after one has put it down, to ponder and surmise.

Its types of character are many and varied, and always skillfully drawn. Mr. Humphrey Crewe, who gives his name to the

volume, is by no means the hero of the story. He is a young millionaire who takes himself very seriously and who, as an outlet for his superabundant energy, goes in for scientific farming and a political career. In the latter activity his "reform" methods are unique and, at times, disconcerting to the honest ones among his adherents.

Prominent among the male characters are the Honorable Hilary Vane, chief counsel in the State for the Northeastern Railroad, and Mr. Augustus Flint, president of this all-powerful corporation. They represent the strong men of affairs—shrewd, practical, successful—always assured of their own integrity and business honor. Their code of ethics is, nevertheless, a singular one—difficult of comprehension by the uninitiated. In the service of these masterful leaders follows a horde of retainers—faithful henchmen who do unquestioningly the bidding of their liege lords. After these come the "plain people"—lowest order in our twentieth-century feudal system.

The political situations are cleverly contrived. The sessions of the Legislature and of the Nominating Convention held at the State capital are described with inimitable skill. Here the author's rare gift of humor stands him in good stead. His story of the man with a sense of humor who once went to the capital as a representative from his town and who died before the year was out, "from laughing too much," is a delicious bit. Likewise, his account of the tribulations of General Doby, sad-faced Chairman of the Nominating Convention, when the fourth ballot showed a total of one thousand and eleven votes out of one thousand accredited delegates!

The real hero of the story is young Austen Vane, whose father, the Honorable Hilary Vane, had devoted twenty-five years of his life to the interests of the Northeastern, Mr. Flint's amalgamated system. The son has inherited from his mother, who died when he was yet a boy, a temperament and a kind of morality at utter variance with the father's nature and the father's code. This supplies the element of tragedy and at the same time prepares the way for the love plot, which is deftly woven and happily consummated.

Mr. Flint, the millionaire magnate, has likewise a child who differs essentially from him in natural endowments and the perception of moral values. In his household, however, the child is a daughter—a young woman of extraordinary grace and charm. The outcome is inevitable; but the movement of the story is sufficiently retarded to keep the reader always on the *qui vive*. There is not a dull page in the book.

Mr. Churchill's English, in former books, has been the target for professional critics and reviewers. Even now it is not above

reproach. Indeed, one is tempted to wonder whether the author has thought it worth while to heed the strictures of rhetoricians and to betake himself to a study of the best authorities. Surely, in certain matters of usage he has yet much to learn; and it is to be deplored that, endowed as he is with very real power as a novelist of American life and character, he does not think it necessary to cultivate an English which, in point of precision, shall rank with that of Thackeray and Henry Fielding.

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

